UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

IMPACT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL ON THE RESETTLEMENT OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS: THE CASE OF NAKURU AND UASIN GISHU COUNTIES, KENYA

CHRISTOPHER NKONGE KIBORO

C80/92681/2013

Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology of the University of Nairobi

August 2018
DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been submitted elsewhere for examination, award of a degree or publication. Where other people’s work, or my own work has been used, this has properly been acknowledged and referenced in accordance with the University of Nairobi’s requirements.

Signature……………………………                                         Date………………

Christopher Nkonge Kiboro
C80/92681/2013
Department of Sociology and Social Work
University of Nairobi

This thesis is submitted with our approval as research supervisors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Octavian Gakuru</td>
<td>…………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sociology and Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O box 30197-00100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ngakuru@uonbi.ac.ke">ngakuru@uonbi.ac.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gidraph Wairire</td>
<td>…………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sociology and Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O box 30197-00100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wairire@uonbi.ac.ke">wairire@uonbi.ac.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family for the steadfast support throughout my studies
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To my supervisors Prof. Octavian N. Gakuru and Dr. Gidraph G. Wairire, thank you for your support and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. Your advice, constructive criticism, insight and knowledge have been invaluable. The long discussions I had with both of you greatly expanded my ability to comprehend complex sociological concepts with an incredible ease. Besides supervision, both of you have been instrumental in shaping my life academically by introducing me to publishing and participating in high level academic conferences. I am thankful that being your student was an incredibly enjoyable and satisfying experience.

To my lecturers, thank you for your encouragement and for ensuring that the experience of being a doctorate student in the Department of Sociology and Social Work was a period of life worth missing so greatly. The quality of training I received at the Department, the academic environment and ethical approach to issues has been source of great inspiration to me during the time of writing this thesis.

To Senator Dr. Agnes Zani, thank you for great advice and guidance you provided in the early stages of this thesis. Your input, moral encouragement and mentorship were instrumental in completing a study of this magnitude. Special mention to Prof. Preston Chitere, Prof. Edward Mburugu, Prof. Yambo, Dr. Kiemo Karatu, and Dr. Edward Ontita. I am grateful for your moral support and your constructive and critical comments during the process of writing my work.

I am grateful to Mr. Ishugha of Moi’s Bridge for sacrificing his time and resources and for ensuring that I arrived in time to interview respondents during field work. You embraced me without minding I was a stranger to you and went out of your way to help me navigate through the vast Uasin Gishu County. God bless you abundantly. I am also greatly indebted to all the chiefs and assistant chiefs in the areas I collected data and to all
the victims of internal displacement who participated in this study. Without you this study would not have been possible. I remain deeply indebted with gratitude to Maureen Ndagara for her assistance in feeding data into the SPSS template and to Purity Rima for providing me with the maps for the study areas. God bless you.

My greatest debt of gratitude is to my uncle Prof. Germano Mwabu. Your unwavering faith in my ability has been a constant source of inspiration. Your constant follow-up and reminders made me to wake up in the middle of the night to work on my thesis. Thank you uncle. May the grace of God be with you.

To my dad and mum, your love has been the engine behind this study. I love you. It will be entirely unfair not to appreciate my brothers and sisters. You showed a lot of concern and your monitoring of my progress provided me with great impetus to keep moving on with my study in spite of the challenges. All of you are wonderful people.

Above all, I would not have come this far without the genuine support and encouragement from my dear wife Fidelis Ngugi. Your input towards the completion of this study is beyond any measure. You were my source of strength when I was at my lowest and never at any point did you turn your head the other way from me. I Love you.

It is not possible to mention each one of them but I am very grateful to all who supported me in one way or the other but are not listed by name in this note of appreciation.

Finally, I owe everything to the Almighty God. Halleluyah!
All shortcomings in this thesis are, however, my responsibility.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ............................................................................................................. ii  
DEDICATION ............................................................................................................ iii  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ............................................................................................... iv  
TABLE OF CONTENTS ............................................................................................. vi  
LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................... x  
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ....................................................................................... xi  
ABSTRACT .................................................................................................................. xiii  
CHAPTER ONE ........................................................................................................... 1  
INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................................... 1  
1.1 Background Information .................................................................................. 1  
1.1.1 Internal Displacement of Persons in Kenya .................................................. 3  
1.2 Statement of the Problem ................................................................................. 8  
1.3 Research Questions ......................................................................................... 9  
1.4 Study Objectives .............................................................................................. 9  
1.4.1 Broad Objective ........................................................................................... 9  
1.4.2 Specific Objectives ...................................................................................... 9  
1.5 Justification of the Study ................................................................................. 10  
1.6 Scope of the Study .......................................................................................... 11  
1.7 Limitations of the Study ............................................................................... 12  
1.8 Definition of Key Concepts ........................................................................... 14  
1.9 Thesis Outline ................................................................................................ 16  
CHAPTER TWO ........................................................................................................ 18  
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ............................................... 18  
2.1 Introduction ..................................................................................................... 18  
2.2 Sources and Determinants of Social Capital ................................................. 18  
2.3 Social Capital and Resettlement of Internally Displaced Persons ................. 21  
2.3.1 Social Capital ............................................................................................ 22  
2.3.2 Forms of Social Capital ............................................................................ 25  
2.3.3 Internal Displacement .............................................................................. 29  
2.4 Social Capital and Household Well-being ..................................................... 40  
2.4.1 Dysfunctions of Social Capital on Social Welfare ................................. 46  
2.5 Sustainability of Social Capital ...................................................................... 48  
2.6 Attributes and Measurements of Social Capital ............................................ 50  
2.7 Summary of Literature Review .................................................................... 55  
2.8 Theoretical Framework .................................................................................. 56  
2.8.1 Social Network Theory ............................................................................. 56  

2.8.2 Theory of Collective Action ......................................................... 60
2.8.3 Rational Choice Theory ............................................................ 62
2.9 Conceptual Framework ............................................................... 66
2.10 Operational Definition of Variables ............................................. 70
  2.10.1 Factors Contributing to the Formation of Social Capital ............. 70
  2.10.2 Forms of Social Capital .......................................................... 71
  2.10.3 Social Capital and Household Welfare ..................................... 72
  2.10.4 Sustainability of Social Capital ................................................ 73
  2.10.5 Resettlement of IDPs .............................................................. 73

CHAPTER THREE ................................................................................. 74
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ............................................................... 74
  3.1 Introduction ................................................................................. 74
  3.2 Research Design ......................................................................... 74
  3.3 The Study Area and Rationale for Selection .................................... 74
    3.3.1 Nakuru County ...................................................................... 75
    3.3.2 Uasin Gishu County .............................................................. 77
  3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size .......................................... 83
  3.5 Unit of Analysis .......................................................................... 87
  3.6 Unit of Observation .................................................................... 87
  3.7 Nature and Sources of Data .......................................................... 88
  3.8 Methods of Data Collection .......................................................... 89
  3.9 Tools of Data Collection .............................................................. 91
  3.10 Field work ............................................................................... 92
  3.11 Data Analysis ........................................................................... 93
  3.12 Challenges related to the Study .................................................... 94
  3.13 Ethical Considerations ............................................................... 95

CHAPTER FOUR ................................................................................... 96
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS ............................................... 96
  4.1 Introduction ............................................................................... 96
  4.2 Demographic Profiles of the Respondents ..................................... 96
  4.3 Groups and Social Networks ....................................................... 100
    4.3.1 Reasons for Joining Community Associations ....................... 104
    4.3.2 Characterization of Group Membership .................................. 109
  4.4 Types of Social Capital .............................................................. 113
    4.4.1 Trust and Solidarity .............................................................. 120
  4.5 Contribution of Social Capital to Household Well-being ............... 127
    4.5.1 Social Capital and Mutual Support ....................................... 131
  4.6 IDPs Levels of Resettlement and Social Integration ....................... 135
    4.6.1 Livelihood Activities after Resettlement ................................ 142
4.6.2 Social Integration ................................................................. 146
4.7 Sustainability of Social Capital.................................................. 149
  4.7.1 Collective Action............................................................... 151
  4.7.2 Determinants of sustainability of social capital ..................... 153
4.8.1 Determinants of Social Capital ............................................. 157
4.8.2 Age and Group Membership ............................................... 159
4.8.4 Marital status and Group Membership ................................. 161
4.8.5 Level of Education and Group Membership ......................... 163
4.8.6 Employment and Group Membership ................................. 165
4.8.7 Income and Group Membership .................................. 166
4.9 Social Capital and Resettlement of IDPs .................................... 167

CHAPTER FIVE ................................................................................. 170
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ................... 170
  5.1 Introduction ........................................................................ 170
  5.2 Summary ........................................................................... 171
    5.2.1 Determinants of Social Capital ....................................... 175
    5.2.2 Types of Social Capital ................................................ 176
    5.2.3 Impact of Social Capital on Household Welfare ............... 176
    5.2.4 Sustainability of Social Capital ................................... 177
  5.3 Conclusions ................................................................. 179
  5.4 Contribution to Knowledge ................................................ 181
  5.5 Policy Recommendations .................................................. 182
  5.6 Recommendations for Further Research .............................. 183
REFERENCES ............................................................................... 185
APPENDICES ................................................................................. 1
  Appendix I: Questionnaire For Individual Respondents ............ 1
  Appendix II: Key Informant Interview Guide ............................. 1
  Appendix III: Interview Guide For Focus Group Discussion .......... 1
  Appendix IV: Interview Guide for Group Leaders ..................... 1
  Appendix V: Observation Matrix ................................................. 1
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Map of Kenya showing the study areas</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Map of Nakuru County with Constituencies</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Map of Uasin Gishu County with constituencies</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Multi-stage Cluster Sampling Flow Chart</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Randomly selected study areas in Nakuru County ........................................... 86
Table 3.2: Randomly selected study areas in Uasin Gishu County ..................................... 86
Table 4.1: Household Demographics ......................................................................................... 97
Table 4.2: Group Membership .................................................................................................. 103
Table 4.3: Group Membership in the Individual Sampled Counties ....................................... 104
Table 4.4: Reasons for Joining Groups ...................................................................................... 108
Table 4.5: Group Membership Composition ............................................................................. 110
Table 4.6: Scope of Social Interaction/Ties .............................................................................. 119
Table 4.7: Generalized Trust ..................................................................................................... 122
Table 4.8: Particularized Trust .................................................................................................. 125
Table 4.9: Social Capital and Access to Essential Services ...................................................... 128
Table 4.10: Social Networks and Mutual Support ..................................................................... 133
Table 4.11: Respondents’ Level of Resettlement ..................................................................... 137
Table 4.12: Sources of Water for Drinking and Domestic Use ................................................ 140
Table 4.13: Level of Resettlement in the Individual Sampled Counties .................................. 142
Table 4.14: Extent of Livelihoods Recovery .............................................................................. 145
Table 4.15: Respondents’ Opinions on Social Integration ........................................................ 148
Table 4.16: Feeling of Togetherness and Social Interaction ...................................................... 150
Table 4.17: Collective Action and Cooperation ......................................................................... 153
Table 4.18: Most Important Factors that help People Live Together as a Community .......... 155
Table 4.19: Cross Tabulation for Age by Group Membership .................................................. 159
Table 4.20: Cross Tabulation of Gender by Group Membership ............................................ 161
Table 4.21: Cross Tabulation for Marital Status by Group Membership ............................... 162
Table 4.22: Cross Tabulation of Education by Group Membership ......................................... 164
Table 4.23: Cross Tabulation for Employment by Group Membership .................................. 165
Table 4.24: Cross Tabulation Results of Income and Group Membership ............................. 166
Table 4.25: Cross Tabulation of Aggregate trust by Level of Settlement ............................... 168
Table 4.26: Cross Tabulation for Social Support by Level of Settlement .............................. 169
## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Constituency Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>International Livestock Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNCHR</td>
<td>Kenya National Commission of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNDRMP</td>
<td>Kenya National Dialogue and Reconciliation Monitoring Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSSP</td>
<td>Ministry of State for Special Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESF</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOL</td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoK</td>
<td>Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSCAs</td>
<td>Rotating Savings and Credit Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIPL</td>
<td>Ventilated Improved Pit Latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEF</td>
<td>Women’s Enterprise Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEDF</td>
<td>Youth Enterprise Development Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Social capital is now gaining greater acceptance among researchers, policy makers and development practitioners as a critical factor in promoting economic growth, creation of secure neighborhoods and sustainable communities. Empirical studies show that communities that are characterized by reasonably huge amount of social capital particularly in the form of community groups at the micro level, have a higher likelihood of realizing improved social development than communities without large amounts of social capital.

This study aimed to investigate the impact of social capital on the resettlement of internally displaced persons in Kenya. The overall objective of the study was to determine the contribution of social capital in the resettlement of internally displaced persons in Kenya. The specific objectives of the study were: to investigate factors that influence the formation of social capital among the internally displaced persons, to analyze the types of social capital that impact on the resettlement of the displaced persons, to assess the impact of social capital in improving the welfare of households of the victims of internal displacement and to explore the factors responsible for the sustainability of social capital among the internally displaced persons.

A survey design was adopted in which both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from households, leaders of community groups, local level government administrators and group members. Questionnaires with closed and open-ended questions and key informant interview schedules were adopted as instruments for data collection. Interviews, observations and focus group discussions were used as the primary methods of data collection. Descriptive and inferential methods were used to analyze the data.
Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to identify factors influencing creation of social capital including test of association between social capital and resettlement of internally displaced persons.

The results show that social capital formation is determined by both individual/household level and community level factors. Marital status, income and education were particularly found to be the key individual level factors that influenced the formation of social capital among the internally displaced persons. At the community level, trust and solidarity, social interaction and collective action were found to be the key drivers in the accumulation of social capital. The results also reveal that three types of social capital: bonding, bridging and linking social capital were present in the study area. However, their prevalence varies significantly with bonding social capital being the dominant type and most important in the day-to-day life of the internally displaced persons.

Overall, the study found that social capital had a positive contribution towards the resettlement of the internally displaced persons. This study has revealed that in absence of institutional support, IDPs make use of their acquired social capital to resettle. Their social networks serve as the primary forms of insurance that they depend on to smooth out the adverse effects of unforeseen exigencies. It also revealed that norms of reciprocity, values such as being trustworthy, and the belief that other people will reciprocate are essential features of community life. Subsequently, people are able to exhibit attitudes of benevolence and make sacrifices in order to help others in times of need. This suggests that trust in neighbors and community, and participation in network structures and groups may improve the quality of life for vulnerable households.
In particular, social capital helped the IDPs to acquire commodities that were essential for their resettlement. This study recommends investments in factors found to be instrumental in promoting the formation of social capital especially among the vulnerable populations. The study further recommends strengthening and building capacities of grassroots associations through training and provision of resources to make such associations more vibrant and sustainable.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information

Social capital is described by a range of features which include norms, trust and density of social networks and the quality of personal connections between members of a particular group. Other significant aspects of social capital comprise rules and norms that sanction social behaviour, network assets, informal social bonds and formal connections, civil freedoms and civic communities, associations and linkages, trust and harmony, cooperative action and assistance, information sharing and social inclusion among other aspects (Putnam, 1993; Grootaert et al. 2004). These characteristics have made social capital to be now highly acknowledged as a significant asset in pursuit of goals for social and economic growth (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998).

Social capital being an outcome of social interaction, yields valuable assets that are utilized in addressing a wide spectrum of issues in the society. Thus, social capital is instrumental in facilitating the realization of some public benefits such as social, political and economic progress (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1993). Subsequently, social capital is attaining international acknowledgment mostly amongst transnational organizations like the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development especially in the sustainability of development projects (World Bank, 1998; OECD, 2003). In Africa, social capital is also widely being appreciated as an essential asset for promoting developmental outcomes. Studies by Grootaert et al. (2002) and Isham, (2002) in Africa, found out that social capital had positive effects in improving household welfare of the poor people.
The government of Kenya also recognizes the importance of social capital in the pursuit of long-term development goals of the country. The Kenya Vision 2030 for instance, recognizes that Kenya’s progress towards becoming a globally competitive and prosperous nation involves among other things the building of a just and cohesive society (Government of Kenya, 2007). The political pillar of the Kenya Vision 2030 envisions a country with a democratic system that reflects the expectations and aspirations of its people. It envisions a country in which equality is guaranteed regardless of one’s background either by race, religion, ethnicity, gender or socio-economic status and a nation that harnesses and respects the diversity of its people’s values and traditions (GoK, 2007).

However, the realization of development goals in majority of African countries including Kenya has largely been hindered by frequent violent conflicts and political instability. It has been reported that since the post-independence period, conflicts in Africa have tended to be widespread, more diverse and violent and have blighted hope for Africa’s development. According to Ake, (2000) and Mlambo, et al. (2009), conflicts in Africa in the past decades have affected over 300 million people directly or indirectly. As a result, about seven million of the total global refugee estimates comprises of Africans and nearly sixteen million out of the twenty five million IDPs globally are also in Africa (Deng, 1994).

Internal displacement of persons is one of the greatest developmental challenges confronting both the national governments and international community (Ferris, 2011). To deal with the crisis experienced around the world as a result of internal displacement, a set of Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were developed and distributed in
1998. However, these principles are not binding on the states. Therefore, IDPs unlike refugees are not recognized under international law. This effectively places the primary responsibility of their protection and assistance on the national government. In Kenya, this poses challenges as the legal framework on IDPs is yet to be implemented. On the international front, the situation is accentuated by lack of a systematic approach to assisting and protecting IDPs despite having a huge proportion of them around the world. Also, unlike refugees, there is no specialized agency at the international level to provide humanitarian response to the IDPs.

1.1.1 Internal Displacement of Persons in Kenya

Internal displacement in Kenya is not a recent phenomenon; rather, it has been occurring periodically throughout the country’s history (Kamungi, 2013). Displacement has been in existence in Kenya since the colonial period and has persisted to the present. In the early 20th century, the British colonialists displaced indigenous communities by evicting them from their most fertile land, turning those areas into White farmlands (Leo, 1984). The problem of forcible evictions in Kenya is closely related to the land occupancy and involuntary displacement by the British colonialists who chose to settle in the most fertile areas in the Rift Valley (Refugee Consortium of Kenya, 2005).

After independence, the majority of the colonialists chose to return to Europe leaving the white farmlands to the Government who in turn sold the land through the famous Land Buying Schemes. Most of the land, however, was bought mainly by the non-indigenous people thus effectively locking out the original owners who had been displaced by the white settlers (Leo, 1984; Refugee Consortium of Kenya, 2005).
Although there were few incidences of resistance to the new buyers of the white farmlands, there was relative calm in these areas until the re-introduction of plural politics in 1991 when land in these areas was used by politicians to invoke ethnic sentiments (National Council of Churches in Kenya, 1992). This was followed by violent ethnic clashes that resulted in wanton destruction of property and massive displacement of persons in the Rift Valley. Majority of the displacees comprised of non-indigenous ethnic communities allied to the political opposition (Human Rights Watch, 1997).

In the last two and half decades, the occurrence of internal displacement has been increasing at a very high rate. For instance, from 1992 through 1997 to 2000, displacement of a large number of people took place in the country. Over 300,000 individuals were evicted in Nyanza, Western province and parts of the Rift Valley during the 1992 electoral period (Kenya Commission of Human Rights, 1998; Katumanga, 2001). Due to displacement, livelihoods are either significantly disrupted or completely destroyed. This does not only impoverish the affected households but it also stifles the poverty reduction strategies put in place by the government.

The run up to the 1997 general elections was another major period of violent ethnic clashes that mainly targeted the non-indigenous people with the view to disenfranchising them their civic right of voting. The purpose of forced displacement was to influence the election outcome in favour of the perpetrators of violence. In the coast region for instance, ethnic clashes caused the displacement of over 120,000 persons (Refugee Consortium of Kenya, 2005).
Apart from ethnic clashes that are politically instigated, other drivers of displacement in Kenya include boundary disputes; natural disasters such as droughts and impacts of climate change; development projects; intercommunity conflicts over access to water and pasture; and local militia attacks (United Nations Development Programme, 2011; Kamungi, 2013).

Although the causes of internal displacement in Kenya are diverse, in recent times political violence has generated unprecedented volume of IDPs in the country (Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, 2010). Patterns of displacement largely appear to follow the electoral cycle particularly since the return of multiparty politics in 1992 (Kamungi, 2013). For example, during 1992, 1997, and 2000 electoral period, large numbers of people were displaced in different parts Kenya (Katumanga, 2011).

In 2007/2008 as a result of disputed elections, Kenya suffered violence of a magnitude that has overshadowed other conflicts and remains the most brutal, destructive and costly in terms of human and material loss. As a result of the violence over 1300 people lost their lives and 600,000 others became victims of involuntary displacement (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2010).

Forced evictions and involuntary movement of populations is one of the current and serious humanitarian issues facing not only the national states but also global organizations including the United Nations. Although the government of Kenya has made efforts to resettle displaced persons through *Operation Rudi Nyumbani* (Operation Return Home) programs whose main objective was to ensure all those people displaced internally during the 2007 post-election violence returned home and continued with their
lives by June 2008, the humanitarian situation of the victims of displacement is still not satisfactory since most of them have not yet recovered their livelihoods. A substantial number of IDPs have no sufficient and suitable housing, food and clothing and have no adequate resources to enable them acquire materials and equipment necessary for re-establishing their livelihoods.

The existence of the internally displaced persons in various regions of Kenya is a strong manifestation that currently there are no sustainable interventions or solutions to the problem. Consequently, there is continued misery and destitution of the populations that were formerly economically stable. Displacement impoverishes individuals and families in form of landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, segregation from public services such as health care services and schooling opportunities, increased disease morbidity and mortality, and lack of access to common property.

In an effort to resolve the problem of IDPs in the country, the Kenyan government initiated various resettlement programmes through the Ministry of State for Special Programmes (MoSSP) in conjunction with the provincial administration. As at 2009, the program had facilitated the return of 255,094 displaced persons to their homes/business areas or new locations (Kenya National Dialogue and Reconciliation Monitoring Project, 2009). However, although the IDPs were provided with building materials and farm inputs to help them resettle, most of them are still living in poor conditions because the support was inadequate (IDMC, 2008).

Research has revealed that, globally, local level associations foster economic productivity by cutting down costs, promoting markets accessibility and providing inputs for farming
as well as microfinance (Narayan and Pritchett, 1997; Grootaert and van Bastelaer, 2002; Isham, 2002). Social capital has also been found to have positive impact on various aspects in Kenya. For example Kirori et al. (2009) found out that families with abundant social capital have the ability to obtain essential needs through non-monetary operations.

Mwangi and Ouma (2012) in their study on Social capital and access to credit in Kenya found out that people who were rich in social capital in terms of membership to many groups had a higher probability of accessing loans especially from commercial institutions. Bisung et al. (2014) found out that social capital may be necessary albeit not sufficient for improving access to water and sanitation in marginalized communities.

In the absence of sufficient institutional support by the state and the international community, victims of internal displacement depend on community networks to collectively resolve problems they face in common. They organize themselves into associative life in the form of community-based associations as a means for addressing their needs (OCHA Kenya, 2009). These associations serve as supplements of informal associations (kinships) by permitting their affiliates to articulate their needs and to produce financial capital and human competences essential for supporting their well-being improvement efforts.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Involuntary displacement results to huge losses of income and other essential property such as land. Moreover, it is also responsible for loss of less concrete but symbolic assets like traditional customs, bonds and a feeling of attachment to a specific locality. The outcomes of forced evictions on individuals and households are far-reaching. They involve exclusion from accessing mainstream and basic services such as education, health care and other welfare enhancing services like access to microcredit. Ultimately, the displaced persons suffer from social isolation and impoverishment.

To deal with the problems associated with displacement, victims of internal displacement organize themselves into self-help groups and associations to help the participants acquire necessary materials for their survival. According to the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Kenya (2009), in 2009 there were eighteen support groups comprising of 6,711 households of IDPs. The emergence of grassroots associations can be attributed to the key features of social associations which include trust, collective norms and social networks which fit into the notion of social capital.

The contribution of social capital in the resettlement of displaced populations in Kenya has not been adequately studied. The resettlement of IDPs in Kenya has largely been based on financial and material resources without due consideration of the value of social capital in the resettlement process. Therefore, it is important to understand the dimensions and impact of social capital on the resettlement of IDPs in Nakuru and Uasin Gishu counties in Kenya. The study is based in Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County which had previously experienced extreme political violence which led to large scale displacement of people more than any other part of the country.
1.3 Research Questions

i. What factors contribute to the creation and strengthening of social capital among victims of displacement?

ii. What form(s) of social capital are useful to the victims of displacement in their quest for resettlement?

iii. To what extent has social capital improved the welfare of victims of displacement?

iv. What are the explanatory factors for the sustainability of the existing social capital among IDPs?

1.4 Study Objectives

1.4.1 Broad Objective

The main objective of the study was to determine the contribution of social capital in the resettlement of internally displaced persons in Kenya.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

i) To investigate factors that influence the formation of social capital among the internally displaced persons.

ii) To analyze the types of social capital that impact on the resettlement of the internally displaced persons.

iii) To assess the impact of social capital in improving the welfare of households of the victims of internal displacement.

iv) To explore the factors responsible for the sustainability of social capital.
1.5 Justification of the Study

In spite of the emphasized importance of social capital by various studies in solving numerous social problems, such as neighborhood improvement (Forrest and Kearns, 2001) water and environmental conservation, there are limited empirical studies on social capital in Kenya with regard to its role on internal displacement and resettlement.

Although a number of studies on social capital have been done in Kenya, for example, a study by Mwakubo, Obare, Omiti and Mohammed (2006) on the influence of social capital on natural resource management in marginal areas of Kenya; Nyangena and Sterner's (2008) study on social capital and institutions in Kenya; Mwangi and Ouma (2012) on social capital and access to credit in Kenya, and its role on rural livelihoods by Kirori (2009), and Kirori (2015) on social capital and policy: a case of rural livelihoods among other studies, there is a gap on empirical analysis of the link between social capital and resettlement of IDPs in Kenya.

The understanding of social capital in relation to the resettlement of IDPs in Kenya is important in contributing to the existing literature by extending the theoretical debate of social capital from economic discourses to the resolution of social problems. The study makes a contribution to the pool of scientific knowledge about IDPs, their social networks and relations as a response to stress and vulnerability brought about by displacement. Also, understanding of social capital is important not only at the state and organizational level, but also at the community level for various reasons.

Understanding how displaced people come to belong and participate in community-wide programmes, and how the process of integration occurs, greatly helps the process of
resettlement and therefore the likelihood of countries improving their resettlement programmes. The understanding of the influence of social capital in addressing problems related to displacement would greatly help government to come up with policies that are evidence based. This would not only make the resettlement process more effective but also rather systematic. Since social capital is a product of social interaction, it would further help the government and other agencies to develop and implement resettlement programs that are human-centered thus making such programs sustainable.

The study findings can be utilized while working with communities affected by different types of conflicts including ethnic or racial to heal and re-knit the social fabric necessary for nurturing reconciliation and achieving enduring peace and sustainable development. It is further hoped that the findings can be instrumental in improving policy on ethnic relations and reconciliation in the country. The results may provide a framework for policy consideration for the government and the affected communities in harnessing and enhancing social capital. From the developmental point of view it is hoped that this study will provide evidence-based information necessary for the design of policy interventions and decision-making with regard to internal displacement of populations.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This research investigated the impact of social capital in the resettlement of the internally displaced persons. Since there are so many IDPs in the country as a result of many factors, this study only targeted people who were displaced from 1992 to 2008 as a result of pre-election and post-election violence. Furthermore, the study targeted those persons who were internally displaced but have since resettled regardless of their level of settlement. Geographically the study was confined to Nakuru and Uasin Gishu Counties.
1.7 Limitations of the Study

In this section, two sets of limitations are presented. The first set relates to how the study was conducted which on reflection could have improved the overall outcome. The second set includes those aspects that the study never sought to cover but failure to be incorporated in the study qualify as a limitation.

First, the development of social capital is largely incremental and cumulative. As such, time is an essential factor in the development of social capital. Therefore, rather than conducting interviews on the temporal aspects of members’ accounts in terms of their membership into groups, involvement in community wide activities, types of bonds formed over time and their ability to access various resources, this study would have wished to adopt a longitudinal research by incorporating long-term participant observation and repeat visits. This would have yielded rich and detailed data that may have provided greater perspective on the exact ways and processes that influence the development of social capital and its subsequent impact on the resettlement of IDPs.

Through more direct and personal experience of some of the core processes within the group and between groups, useful data might have been generated through longitudinal research thus the study would have benefitted by adopting an active participant role. Unfortunately, due to resource and time constraints, longitudinal research was beyond the purview of this study. Nevertheless, this limitation was overcome by combining different methods to collect data. Hence methodological triangulation helped in collecting the data that helped in arriving at valid findings and conclusions.
Second, social capital is a broad concept with many dimensions. Consequently, measuring social capital is a complex exercise. For example, this study would have wished to measure as many dimensions of social capital as possible including online ties. However, the design of the instruments used did not provide means for integrating online ties into the study. Today, internet has become embedded in people’s lives and has significantly influenced the emergence of virtual ties which could have instrumental value such as resolving the problem of information asymmetry among the users.

This study relied on data from victims of displacement caused by political violence. It did not include respondents displaced by other causes such as environmental factors or development projects. As such, the findings of this study have immediate relevance only to victims of displacement as a consequence of political violence. Any effort to apply the results to other populations should be done with caution because the social circumstances of people displaced by political violence is expected to vary substantially from the general population or people displaced by other forces. The findings are also limited to populations that are internally displaced and not those that cross internationally recognized borders (refugees). Despite these limitations, the results of this study are valid and credible in the sense that efforts were made to address the limitations in a scientific manner.
1.8 Definition of Key Concepts

Community groups: A collection of people who come together with a common purpose to achieve specific goals.

Community: A collection of households who live near one another and interact with each other regularly.

Household head: The person who is recognized by other members of the household as the head and main decision maker.

Household: All people living in one dwelling or compound and sharing food preparation and consumption.

Internally Displaced Persons: These are persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflicts, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border.

Reciprocity: Refers to a relationship of mutual interdependence between one or more parties where the action(s) of one party motivates the other to return a favour to the other party/actor in a relationship.
Resettlement: The process of ensuring that livelihoods and social systems are restored, and that the lives of the affected people are substantially improved.

Social capital: The sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from network of relationships possessed by an individual or a social unit.

Social integration: A situation where the displaced and the hosts are able to live together and share assets in an area and participate completely and freely in all spheres of society without conflict.

Social networks: Refers to the social ties or nodes between and among people in an association. This includes membership into social groups, the characteristics of group membership as well as the degree of interaction of these groups with other associations both within and outside the neighborhood where the group is found.

Trust: The amount of confidence people have in others that they will honour what they commit themselves to.
1.9 Thesis Outline

This thesis is organized into five chapters as follows:

Chapter One: Introduction. This chapter provides the background information to the study beginning with brief information about social capital and internal displacement. It also provides the historical developments that led to the increasing number of IDPs in the country. The chapter also contains the problem statement, study objectives and the research questions as well as justification of the study. It also highlights the scope of the study and a simple definition of key terms.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework. This chapter provides an elaborate literature review in the sequence of key variables of the study. In this chapter, literature is organized into the following topics: sources and determinants of social capital, social capital and the resettlement of internally displaced persons, forms of social capital, social capital and social well-being, dysfunctions of social capital on social welfare, sustainability of social capital and attributes and measurement of social capital. The theoretical framework used in the study is also presented in this section.

Chapter Three: Research Methodology. This chapter describes the research methodology that was applied in this study. The chapter begins with the description of the research design used, a description of the study site and the rationale for its selection, the sampling procedure employed, and the nature and type of data used. The process of data collection is also described, the type of methods used and challenges encountered in the process. The chapter also contains a brief description of data analysis techniques used and concludes with a discussion on ethical considerations.
Chapter Four: Data Presentation and Analysis. The chapter presents results emanating from the research data and subsequent analysis. In this chapter, research results are presented and elaborated on and are arranged in accordance with the research questions. The results discussed herein are derived from the empirical data specifically generated for this study. For answering the overarching research question, four sub-questions have been stated dealing with factors that contribute to the creation and strengthening of social capital among victims of displacement; form(s) of social capital that are useful to the victims of displacement in their quest for resettlement; the extent to which social capital has improved the welfare of victims of displacement, and the explanatory factors for the sustainability of social capital in Kenya.

Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations. This chapter presents a summary of the empirical results and discusses the contribution of the study to new knowledge. It also contains the, conclusions, policy recommendations and recommendations for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In recent times there has been an increasing interest among researchers and policy makers in the links between social capital and economic development. Many of the studies have focused on the influence of social capital on effectiveness of economic enterprises and effectiveness of governments (Olson 1982; North 1990; Grootaert 1998; collier and Hoeffler 1999). There is however very little exploration on the contribution of social capital in several areas among them the resettlement of internally displaced persons. This chapter presents a review of literature on social capital and its impact on the resettlement of internally displaced persons.

The literature presented in this chapter is arranged into different themes derived from the objectives of the study. Section 2.2 reviews literature on the sources and determinants of social capital while section 2.3 and 2.4 provide reviews on social capital and resettlement of internally displaced persons and on social capital and household welfare respectively. Section 2.5 and 2.6 provides a review on sustainability of social capital and on attributes and measurements of social capital. A brief summary of literature review is presented in section 2.7. The second part covers theories, the conceptual framework as well as the operational definition of the variables in sections 2.8 and 2.9 respectively.

2.2 Sources and Determinants of Social Capital

In an attempt to develop a consistent and integrated framework concerning the nature of social capital and its relationship to socioeconomic performance, studies have paid much attention to the determinants of social capital. Numerous studies have empirically tested
the net effect of individual and aggregate-level factors such as social trust and group membership on the components of social capital (Helliwell, 1996; Brehm and Rahn, 1997; Krishna and Uphoff, 1999; Glaeser et al. 2000; Costa and Kahn, 2001; and Rothstein and Stolle, 2001).

Stone and Hughes (2002) emphasize on personal characteristics as important determinants of social capital. Such personal attributes include income and level of education; family and social status. The World Bank (2000); OECD (2001) on the other hand, put more emphasis on the effect of more institutionalized or systemic factors such as income inequality, degree of confidence in government, fairness or neutrality of policy-making institutions, and previous patterns of co-operation and association amongst individuals in a group.

In studies investigating determinants of social capital, Helliwell (1996); Brehm and Rahn (1997); Glaeser et al. (2000) and Rothstein and Stolle (2001) identified other factors such as education as significant in enhancing individual incentives to group membership thus contributing to the expansion of social capital. Education as a determinant of social capital is viewed from various perspectives. First, education is viewed as a factor that develops opportunities for communal action, again in two different ways: either by providing access to social networks and personal acquaintances or by imparting values and norms that creates a proclivity of citizenship and solidarity in individuals. Secondly, education can be seen as a means of acquiring social status, which complements human capital in producing higher income.
Brehm and Rahn (1997) identified employment as a determinant of social capital. They observed that unlike employment, unemployment could create a very strong disincentive for group membership. For example, the unemployed lack income to afford and sustain group membership or alternatively spend their free time searching for a job and securing a source of minimum income rather than participating in groups (Jahoda, Lazaarsfeld and Zeisel, 2002).

Age is another factor that appears in a number of empirical studies on determinants of social capital. For instance, Glaeser et al. (2000) using a sample of individuals from the United States, provide evidence of the significance of age as a determinant of social capital. They reported that profile of social capital varies over the lifecycle of an individual, so that group membership is often higher during the working period of one’s lifecycle; i.e. when a person is in his or her 30s and 40s.

Income is another variable that has closely been empirically examined as a determinant of social capital. Glaeser et al. (2000) established that the relationship between income and group membership is positive and statistically significant. They thus conclude that the wealthier an individual is, the higher the likelihood to participate in groups. Furthermore, persons with higher levels of income are more likely to purchase group membership.

Gender and marital status are also documented in the social capital literature as determinants of social capital. In a US study, Costa and Kahn (2001) reported that where participation of women in labor force in formal organizations has increased during recent
decades, social capital produced in the home, in the form of visiting friends and entertaining at home has reduced amongst women.

The World Bank (2000) and OECD (2001) analyzed various sources of social capital. They include the civil society, local communities, schools, family, firms, gender, the public sector, and ethnicity. Focusing more on individual demographic characteristics, Hughes and Stone (2003) claimed that a person’s stock of social capital may fluctuate because of a number of elements that include household conditions, occupation, age, sex, level of education, health, home-ownership status (male headed or female headed), attitudes and values as well as the features of the area in which the individual lives.

Rose (1997) focused on those factors that are vital in influencing economic activities and have an effect on individual’s capacity for productive engagement. These factors include age, education, gender, and physical health. She argued that these are the aspects that will influence some individuals to participate in particular types of social networks.

2.3 **Social Capital and Resettlement of Internally Displaced Persons**

In order to be able to assess the role of social capital in the resettlement of displaced persons in Kenya, understanding both the underlying components of social capital and internal displacement in general is of utmost importance. Also, a review of literature on the various forms of social capital is critical because it provides a framework for determining what sort of social capital is most significant in the resettlement of IDPs.
2.3.1 Social Capital

Social capital, even though not a new idea, gained popularity in classical sociology and development studies in the 18th century (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Woolcock, 1998). World Bank (1999) conceives social capital as the institutions, interactions, and rules that govern the quality and quantity of a society’s social relationships. Growing evidence indicates that social unity is vital for societies to economically succeed and achieve for sustainable development. Social capital is not just the totality of institutions which support a society; rather, it is the fastener that binds them together (http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/whatsc.htm).

Coleman (1988:95) on the other hand defines social capital as responsibilities and expectations, communication channels, and social rules. Putnam (1993) views social capital as those elements of social arrangement, such as relationships of individuals or families, and the related customs and principles that build externalities for the whole community. Coleman (1990:304) further defines social capital as “some aspect of social structure that enables the achievement of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence”.

Bourdieu (1986) differentiates between economic capital, cultural capital and social capital. Social capital is “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1986:248). He identified social capital as an essential factor in envisaging individual progress or benefits which arise to individuals through
participation in networks or membership in a group. Narayan (2000) refers to social capital as benefits of membership within a social network.

Social networks comprise of the social structures, social relationships and interaction among people. For example, Narayan and Petesch (2002) in a study carried out in Indonesia report that poor people in the study communities felt closest to and relied most heavily on mutual support and self-help groups that they formed themselves. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) define social capital as ‘the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from network of relationships possessed by an individual or a social unit’ (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998, 243).

Helliwell and Putnam (1995), Helliwell (1996) and Uphoff (1986) view social capital as a community level public resource that is embedded in society rather than in any single individual. Hence, the assertion that the worth of social capital emanates from actors who include individuals, institutions and organizations that use it to advance their individual or communal interests.

Lin (2001) conceives social capital as investment in social networks with anticipated benefits in the market place. Lin’s understanding of social capital somewhat encompasses the concepts of others like Bourdieu (1986), Coleman (1988) and Putnam (1993) who described it as the existence of a certain set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permit cooperation among them. Portes (1998) in a similar version argues that whereas economic capital is in people’s bank accounts and human capital is inside their heads, social capital inheres in the structure of their relationships.
Therefore, to possess social capital, a person must be related to others, and it is those others, not himself, who are the actual source of his or her advantage.

In their formulations, Burt (2000) and Lin (2001) refer to the resources such as information, ideas, and support that individuals are able to secure by virtue of their relationships with other people as capital. They explain that unlike physical capital which includes tools and technology, or human capital which is essentially the property of individuals, social capital on the other hand, is wholly obtained through membership into social groups. Thus reciprocity is a crucial principle since for social capital to have functional value, there must be exchange between either two or more people.

Another similar formulation of social capital is the work of Grootaert et al. (2004). They explain that whereas physical capital (tools, technology) refers to physical objects and human capital refer to such things as education and skills, which are the individual possessions, social capital refers to the relationships among individuals-social linkages and the norms of mutual exchanges and dependability that result from them.

Based on the foregoing mentioned studies, the concept of social capital has been picked and applied to a broad spectrum of social sectors, especially its function in building manpower, and in the growth of economic firms, regions and states (Putnam, 1993; Fukuyama, 1995). The fundamental premise of social capital is that social networks contain useful resources for the conduct of social affairs because they provide their members with collectively owned capital (Bourdieu, 1986).
Since the publication of Putnam’s (1993) work on Italian communities in north and south Italy, the concept of social capital has strongly influenced mainstream thinking on solving a broad range of community problems (Woolcock, 1998). Indeed, the idea of social capital has been widely adopted by economists, thus supplementing physical and human capital in order to explain economic performance of enterprises and effectiveness of government. However, despite the increasing popularity of social capital, it does not enjoy a commonly agreed upon definition. Therefore, it is defined differently by different people (Dasgupta and Serageldin, 2000).

Hence, expressions that are frequently used in the definition are cooperative norms (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1993; Knack and Keefer, 1997; Putnam, 2000; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000), trust (Putnam, 1993; Knack and Keefer 1997), and networks that enable people to act collectively (Putnam, 1993; 2000; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000; Sobel, 2002). Therefore, without underrating the importance of having a commonly agreed upon definition, this study contends that much energy and focus should be on those aspects of social capital that influence development outcomes in terms of growth, equity, and poverty reduction.

2.3.2 Forms of Social Capital

Literature on social capital distinguishes various forms of social capital. This distinction is particularly important for this study because it provides an analytical framework for determining which forms of social capital are more important in terms of the functional significance in the resettlement of displaced populations. Social capital is the resources produced by individuals through interaction with one another, thus establishing trustworthy relationships based on shared understanding. Hence, social capital is a group
asset because it is only available to individuals through interacting with other actors (Grootaert et al. 2004). Hence, huge amounts of social capital enable the emergence of shared norms within social groups and networks.

Owing to its comprehensive character, there is a general agreement among scholars that social capital is not a single entity (Grootaert et al. 2004). Hence, various kinds of social capital have been differentiated. In effect, the distinct types of social capital further distinguish various relationships among actors, including the different values and norms that differentiate each tie from the other. Coleman (1988) identifies three types of social capital. The first is obligations, expectations and trustworthiness of structures, the second is information channels, and the third consists of norms and effective sanctions.

Uphoff and Wijayaratna (2000) distinguish between organizational, also known structural, and cognitive social capital. Structural social capital represents the social networks, obligations, guidelines, and patterns of interaction that are rather obvious and objective. These would include institutional forms like membership into a group as well as casual networks and loose interactions. Cognitive social capital on the other hand comprises of the beliefs, rules, trust, and attitudes, which are premised on subjective, mental processes that are shared within a group or in a society.

Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) went further to make distinctions between different kinds of social capital as applied at the organizational level. At the organizational level, they identified three forms of social capital: the structural, relational, and cognitive dimensions of social capital. They described structural social capital as the sum total of the patterns of relationships between the actors, including and not limited to the existence
or lack of network ties among actors and the network features. The indicators include density, connectivity, hierarchy, and proper organization.

Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) described cognitive dimension of social capital as those resources that provide shared representation, interpretation, and systems of meaning in developing a common frame of reference between actors which include shared medium of communication and codes, and shared stories. The relational dimension refers to contacts that people have established with one another through a history of exchanges also referred to as actor bonds (Hakansson and Snehota, 1995). The key indicators of this dimension are trust and trustworthiness, norms and sanctions, roles and expectations, and identity and identification.

Fox and Gershman (2001) too identify three types of social capital. These include: local horizontal social capital which forms the basis for grassroots action; the horizontally and vertically linked social capital which serves as a medium for negotiating among actors within a participatory policy framework; and inter-sectoral social capital which is generated between diverse constituent partners of national and international actors.

The most recent formulation of different forms of social capital is attributed to Narayan (1999); Putnam (2000); Woolcock (1998); NESF (2003); OECD (2001); Aldridge and Halpern (2002); Groves et al. (2003) and Gittel and Vidal (1998). They distinguish social capital into three forms namely: (i) bonding social capital (ii) bridging social capital (iii) and linking social capital.
Bonding social capital refers to the value attached to social networks of homogeneous groups of people otherwise referred to as closed networks (Coleman, 1988). Such groups share common characteristics with respect to socio-demographic aspects, kinship connections, acquaintances, work mates and neighbors. In small territorial communities, bonding social capital is associated with shared identity and a strong sense of belonging. Therefore, bonding social capital tends to be more important to the quality of everyday life since it is the source of resources and support for getting by in life. This is the categorization adopted by this study.

Bridging social capital involves connections to people with dissimilar characteristics. These are socially heterogeneous ties or ‘weak’ ties that connect people into horizontal associations. The ties cut across social groups and can make it possible for a member of different networks to access resources and opportunities that exist in one network through another. The idea of bridging social capital is synonymous with the concept of ‘weak ties’ as discussed in Granovetter’s (1973) thesis.

Linking social capital involves linkages of one’s ties to people of different social strata particularly with persons in positions of authority such as politicians and administrators. These include vertical ties or power relationships and generally those links beyond the community into formal organizations at higher levels in the power hierarchy. Such ties provide access to external resources including financial capital and access to decision-making. Hence the main difference between bridging social capital and the linking social capital is that the former represents horizontal tie or interactions while the latter manifests vertical interactions.
2.3.3 Internal Displacement

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are persons or groups of people who have been forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or man-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border (Deng, 1995). This definition distinguishes people who are uprooted within their country from refugees who must cross a nationally recognized border.

IDPs fall under three main categories according to the factors that led to their displacement. The first category consists of IDPs who have fled due to insecurity and other politically volatile situations. Deng (1995) points out that most of the time IDPs have had to flee their homes because of internal conflicts, communal violence, forced relocation and/or other human rights violations, that make them vulnerable within the borders of their own countries especially in situations where state structures and their ability to protect them have either collapsed or been compromised.

The second category comprises of development induced IDPs. These are people or groups of people who are compelled to move in order to create room for large scale development projects such as airports, dams and roads. The World Bank estimates that nearly 10 million people are displaced this way annually across the globe (Cernea, 2000).

The third type of IDPs is the environment-induced displacees. These are the people or groups of people who are directly or indirectly displaced by environmental, natural or man-made hazards. In 1995, 25 million displacees fell under this category across the
world (Myers, 1997). The figure was projected to reach 50 million by 2010 (Cardy, 2003). Collectively, these include victims of natural hazards related to climate change such as floods, earthquakes, desertification as well as man-made destructions such as deforestation, land degradation and water pollution among others.

Besides the three broad categories of IDPs, literature on internal displacement in Kenya provides a deeper analysis of internally displaced populations. Consequently, IDPs have been divided into seven distinct categories (Jesuit Refugee Services, 2001). The first category comprises the evictees who were once land owners but lost their legal right of land ownership. According to JRS (2001), these are persons who initially possessed title deeds to their parcels of land who, after displacement and upon returning, discovered that their land had either been sold or transferred without their knowledge or consent. There are two ways in which these IDPs were dispossessed their land. For some of them, their land was reallocated to people from other ethnic groups. Others had their title deeds rendered invalid since their land happened to be within areas that were later gazetted as forest or water catchment areas. Tragically, those affected were neither compensated nor were they resettled on alternative land (JRS, 2001).

The Global IDP Project (2004) identifies the second category of IDPs in accordance with JRS (2001) classification as the insecure land owners. These refer to people who retain the ability to access their land, but cannot rebuild their houses or embark on development projects because of persistent tension and insecurity. According to the JRS (2001) report, this category of IDPs is mostly found in parts Mt. Elgon, Molo, Njoro, Nakuru and the surrounding areas. They work on the farms but only do so from the safety of nearby trading centers where they live in rented accommodation.
The third category of IDPs in Kenya according to JRS (2001) is **displaced squatters**. These are people who lived on other people’s land and were ordered to vacate those lands during the clashes. Those who resisted had their homes were demolished or burnt down. As a result, a substantial number of displaced squatters moved into the streets and shopping centers.

*Dispersed displacees* are the fourth category of IDPs according to JRS (2001) classification. These are mostly from the demolished IDPs’ camps. For example, when Maela camp was demolished, IDPs living there were put in trucks and forcibly returned to Kiriti, Ol kalou and Ndaragwa in what was then called Central province. According to the JRS (2001) report, the majority were not able or willing to return to their original homes due to trauma. This compelled some to move into shanties at Maela shopping center while others found their way into the streets or slum areas and still others sought refuge with their relatives. Another group disappeared to other parts of the country.

The fifth category according to the report is *revenge displacees*. These are commonly found in the Rift Valley. The JRS (2001) report points out that the 1992 clashes, particularly affected mainly those originating from outside the Rift Valley but who had bought or otherwise acquired land there. The common belief is that the simmering ethnic tensions have led to revenge or retaliatory attacks. For example, there have been revenge attacks involving the Kalenjin and Kikuyu communities.

*Orphans* are also classified as a distinct category of IDPs by JRS (2001). The report claims that there are over one hundred orphaned children, some of whom lost both parents during the 1992 violence. In addition, a substantial number were also born during
and after displacement, and have no idea of their homes or origin. They do not understand the circumstances that led their parents to migrate. Some may have lost or been separated from relatives, and hence have no one and no place to go back to. As a result, most of the orphans are on the streets or offering manual labour on nearby farms.

*Displaced pastoralists* are the final and the seventh category of IDPs according to JRS (2001). According to JRS (2001) argument, given the nomadic nature of pastoralists and their system of communal land ownership, displacement among pastoralists refers to shifting to another area rather than moving into camps. To many people, these groups do not necessarily qualify to be referred to as IDPs. However, JRS (2001) argue that they are indeed IDPs because when they lose their cattle to rustling, and insecurity forces them to abandon watering points, they move to more volatile environment. In addition, they are compelled to move far away from schools and other basic social amenities. This comprehensive classification of IDPs by JRS (2001) in Kenya is important because it does not only bring out the differences between different groups, but it can serve as an important framework for determining the appropriate interventions for each specific category.

Literature on internal displacement shows that there is growing international awareness on the subject (Ferris, 2011). Mooney (2005) also observes that it is in recent past that the phenomenon of internal displacement started attracting growing international awareness, and from then on, the global attention to internal displacement and the problems of the affected populations has increased. Mooney (2005) further notes that previously it was only refugees who were given special status and recognition under international law; however, today, as a result of recognizing internal displacement as a legitimate issue of
concern on the international agenda, considerable achievements have been made particularly in formulating a working definition of internally displaced persons. Having a recognized and unequivocal definition is vital in identifying the populations of concern and their particular requirements, profiling data on them, and formulating laws and policies designed to help them (Bennet, 1998).

Bennet (1998), also notes that the prevailing gaps in the international law, necessitated the formulation of the United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement which governments and international aid organizations can adopt and/or apply. However, the greatest challenge is that these principles are not legally binding and therefore their implementation depends on the willingness of any given country to do so. IDMC (2009) on the other hand argues that the world over, people are still caught in situations of internal displacement where they face various challenges to their enjoyment of rights and entitlements thus making them more prone to vulnerable situations. Therefore, there is greater need for IDPs to be accorded specialized attention.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (2009) also points out that IDPs movement and free choice of residence are often arbitrarily curtailed, and that they have no access to personal documentation which in effect undermines their ability to enjoy their civil rights. A situation that Karlin (2008) considers to be a contravention of the provision that IDPs should enjoy equal rights, freedoms and privileges as enshrined in the global and local laws and just like other citizens; they should not be victims of any discrimination due to their status as IDPs. These arguments form the basis for the assertion that IDPs should be treated as a special category.
On the other hand, some scholars have argued that there are serious and unintended consequences of addressing IDPs as a special category. Instead, focus should be on addressing what happens to the status of citizens when individuals move within their country. Brun (2003) for instance, defines citizenship as a range of formal and informal processes that determines people’s inclusion in, and exclusion from a variety of symbolic and material spaces and resources.

The argument therefore is that when citizens become IDPs, their access to citizenship changes; something that results to a struggle for citizenship with the aim of regaining one’s place and status in society. Brun (2003) explains that the problem is that when one has status of IDP, he or she becomes separate from other citizens, resulting into a restriction of rights rather than securing them. Hence IDPs are separated from their co-citizens, which implicitly lead to discrimination rather than preventing it.

Borton et al. (2005) argued that in reality, IDPs are heterogeneous rather than a homogeneous group formed only by deprived people. Some IDPs are far better off than other vulnerable groups, including people who did not flee their homes yet are facing the same violence and insecurity. Cohen and Deng (1998) concur with this reasoning by suggesting that addressing situations might be more important instead of focusing on categories of persons.

Hashimoto (2003) further criticizes the concept of displacement by pointing out that it has increasingly become irrelevant particularly in terms of actual protection and assistance activities. The idea is that assistance to IDPs should not be premised on the IDPs status, but rather on the fact that they are in a humanitarian crisis that is in desperate
need of aid. A situation that according to Borton et al. (2005) makes IDPs become the priority of assistance such that the community needs are ignored, thus making IDPs more privileged over other vulnerable groups.

These arguments reveal the divergent views within the debate as to whether the internally displaced persons should be considered as a category requiring special attention or should be considered as part of the broader term of vulnerable people. The controversy lies on the rights and entitlement of IDPs. One side of the discussion argues that there are serious and unintended consequences of addressing IDPs as a special category. Instead, focus should be on addressing what happens to the status of citizens when individuals move within their country.

The other group advocates the view that IDPs should be treated as a special category. This side of the argument derives their moral opinion from the human rights framework. The basic argument is that since the international community attention on IDPs is growing, so should be the awareness on whether or not human rights and humanitarian law provide for sufficient protection for IDPs. However, unlike international law on refugees, the international IDP law guaranteeing legal protection for the IDPs is non-existent. The conclusion is that the present law has numerous gaps and that it does not cover adequately protection for IDPs.

In Kenya, as elsewhere, IDPs have been killed or maimed when they made attempts to return to their former homes. Continual insecurity associated with mobilized youth and the failures of the criminal justice system have had a detrimental role in the return and reintegration of IDPs (Klopp, Githinji, and Karuoya, 2010). This situation leaves the
displaced persons with no choice other than devising their own ways of coping with the situation.

In recent times, there has been an increasing interest to identify the various strategies of coping with displacement. In the context of IDPs, coping can be understood to refer to the series of activities that IDPs develop to access resources, promote their welfare and protect themselves from threats. Literature on coping strategies helps map the discussion on how IDPs respond to displacement, pursue livelihood particularly with regard to how they make use of networks and associations. It further helps to differentiate between the strategies embraced by IDPs working in isolation to access resources and by those IDPs aligned to social networks and associations.

Scholars indicate that securing of livelihoods is crucial in enabling IDPs cope with displacement. Jacobsen (2002) conceives livelihoods as comprising of how people access and make use of resources that enable them to increase their economic security; hence reducing the vulnerability created and exacerbated by displacement, and how they pursue goals that are essential for survival and possible return. This implies that IDPs in pursuit of livelihoods must consider the resources that are at their disposal, establish strategies to mobilize and obtain those resources, and prioritize their goals.

According to Brun (2003) having a status of IDP can itself elicit discriminatory tendencies where IDPs may not be regarded as full citizens of their new communities and can be effectively excluded from accessing certain resources. She argues that the better IDPs are able to integrate with their hosts, and obtain citizenship in these communities, the stronger their ability to gain entrance and acceptance into the local community.
Evidence from a collaborative evaluation of IDPs between the International Committee of the Red Cross and World Food Programme (2005) revealed that among the Colombian IDPs, informal networks of family and friends served the important function of promoting access to food, shelter and other basic needs. The study argued that since many of the conflict-affected individuals, families, and groups leave behind their possessions and means of livelihood, social capital serve an important function of providing goods and services which displaced households would not otherwise have access to.

A study of IDPs in camps in Khartoum, Sudan by Jacobsen et al. (2001) documented how various associations of chiefs, elders, and communities have organized networks that play some important function. These networks provide crucial information to IDPs, mediate between the government and the IDP population, and work with other ethnic groups to promote social co-existence. Jacobsen (2002) working with refugees also observed that these new forms of networks and organizations develop as a consequence of having to cope with flight-related trauma, loss, and antagonism from the host community and local authorities.

Timgum (2003) and ICRC and WFP (2005) report that as a result of marginalization, joblessness, food insecurity, impoverishment and social disintegration, displaced populations often find themselves economically marginalized for various reasons. First, they arrive in new areas after abandoning their livelihood assets which include land, livestock and housing. Consequently, many of the displaced populations especially those, whose skills were primarily agriculturally-based, encounter challenges in utilizing their skills in pursuit of livelihoods particularly those who end up in urban areas.
To cope up with the situation, some of the individual strategies that IDPs use while working alone in search of their livelihood include searching for paid employment in the city, turning to prostitution and engaging in small businesses (Boutin and Nkurunziza, 2001). They however, point out that those IDPs that pursue individual strategies to access resources face greater challenges than those working with networks and associations.

The broad argument is that those who work in groups and align themselves with networks and associations find employment and gain protection more easily than those working in isolation. Social networks provide members with access to assets, services, livelihoods, shelter, and education and promote positive mental health and the overall well-being. For example, in Kenya, the commonly seen adaptation strategy among IDPs is utilizing community linkages and social connections or, employing social capital (OCHA Kenya, 2009).

Although the concept of social capital has been in existence in the Kenyan indigenous communities, the history of studies on social capital in Kenya is fairly recent (Kirori, 2009). The studies by Narayan and Nyamwaya (1996) have been listed by Sabatini (2007) as being the earliest of the studies on social capital in Kenya. Notable however, is that literature on social capital in respect to resettlement of IDPs in the country is particularly scarce. This scarcity prompts the use of evidence from literature available elsewhere with few significant modifications.

A strand of literature that is closer to social capital and resettlement of IDPs is literature on the role of social networks and social capital on the resettlement of refugees. This strand of literature is used here in the understanding that the difference between refugees
and IDPs is subtle. Whereas refugees must cross internationally recognized state borders, IDPs remain within the borders of the country of displacement (Deng, 1995). The underlying argument is that since both groups are victims of displacement, they are more or less exposed to similar problems. Therefore, it is my view that this literature will help in establishing the potential role of social capital in the resettlement of IDPs in Kenya.

According to Suter and Magnusson (eds) (2015), social capital is seen as valuable for the wider resettlement process. It has beneficial effects on a range of important factors such as accessing the resources and information needed to achieve socio-economic and psychological well-being of displaced populations. Jacobsen (2006) and Massey and Aysa-Lastra (2011) observe that social linkages and community networks are central to the process and patterns of migration, particularly in unregulated migratory systems such as that seen in Kenya, as many refugees engage in self-resettlement.

Campbell (2006) points out social networks are utilized in myriad ways throughout resettlement including determining the resettlement locations. Huot (2014) found out that in the absence of institutional support and protection, refugees and by extension displaced people harness the social capital of their communities in order to facilitate livelihoods independent of the formal economy to bridge support gaps. For example, refugees in Nairobi utilized social capital to access livelihood opportunities, shelter, and as a structure for protection and support.

Social capital has also been described by Bryceson (1996) as an essential resource for promoting and supporting various income generating activities and access to opportunities and assets to families. Baron, et al (2000) also notes that social capital is a
beneficial resource that supports the livelihood and coping strategy of households as it allows people to act more effectively in pursuit of common objectives.

It is argued that communities with strong social capital have a greater access to outside resources, expertise, and funding due to their connections with institutions outside their immediate community (Wagner and Gimenez, 2008). This is important for the resettlement of IDPs because many do not have a social service specifically focused on them. For example, van Bastelaer (2000) found out that social capital in form of social networks is important in facilitating access to credit by the poor.

According to van Bastelaer (2000), social capital helps to close the gap in financial structure by combining borrowers and lenders in a way that commercial banks are unable to do. This is critical for the resettlement of IDPs as it enables them to access additional resources necessary for sustainable resettlement. The personal ties between borrowers and the pressure that emanates from these ties becomes the collateral that enables them to borrow from group lenders.

2.4 Social Capital and Household Well-being

Social capital is well recognized for its role in poverty alleviation especially among poor families (Grootaert et al. 2002). Woolcock (2001) claims that communities with large amount of social capital are not highly exposed to vulnerabilities and possess better capability to address their struggles including taking advantage of opportunities for further improvement. Therefore, the principal understanding is that social capital is of great significance in poverty reduction initiatives (Putnam, 2000). Empirical findings show that social capital has positive influence on the family well-being (Grootaert, 1999;
Narayan and Pritchett, 1997; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). Grootaert (2000); Grootaert and Narayan (2000); Grootaert, Oh and Swammy (2002) found out that in Bolivia, Burkina Faso and Indonesia social capital had a positive and significant contribution to the household well-being.

The above studies reveal through social connections support households, mostly the poor ones, to generate supplementary resources that assist them to meet their everyday needs. Accordingly, the mutual relationships work as sources of social, monetary and political support which they rely on whenever a need arises. Moreover, Grootaert et al. (2002) established that families belonging to local associations with active ties have more access to credit, even if monetary needs were not the main goal of such groups.

In the absence of insurance opportunities and formal financial institutions, particularly in non-industrialized countries, many households count on community organizations to obtain monetary and social support and to reduce the possibility of being exposed to shocks (Rosenzweig, 1988; Fafchamps, 1992; Townsend, 1994; Udry, 1994; Gakuru, 2002; Fafchamps and Lund, 2003). For example, Narayan and Pritchett (1997) noted that social capital may well act as a safety net for alleviating the effects of unfavourable consequences. This implies that societies that have large amounts of social capital may engage in big profitable and risky projects because of greater distribution of household risk. As a result, such households are able to realize better returns. In this respect, a major contribution is made by family networks whose affiliation is ascribed either through consanguinity, affinity or adoption.
Studies have revealed that social capital promotes communal behavior, thereby fostering economic well-being through enhanced sharing of information and elimination of unscrupulous tendencies because of rules that regulate conduct (Putnam, 1993; Grootaert, 1997; Uphoff and Wijayaratna, 2000; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000; Grootaert et al. 2004; Cummings et al. 2006;). Similarly, Narayan and Pritchett (1997) states that societies that have huge amount of social capital have a higher likelihood of lowering business costs, and reduce uncertainty because of improved access to information about the prevailing market conditions.

Investors depend on their social connections to address the problem of lack of access to information by easing the flow of news regarding the prior actions, the current condition and the expected conduct of their business counterparts and other actors (Bigsten et al. 2000). Portes and Sensenbrenner (1998) found out that Asia and Middle East commerce is stimulated by social capital.

Burt (1992) established that social networks have a direct influence on economic growth by availing information to investors on the state of affairs, particularly with regard to new discoveries and markets. Thus, social capital enhances the ability to share information. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) identify social capital as a vital component in promoting learning, innovation and adaptive efficiency. Consequently, social capital is also essential in the analysis of organizational behaviour, invention and value addition.

Social capital performs an important role not only in the growth of an enterprise but also of regions. Putnam (1993) confirmed that due to variations in the amount of social capital, some regions in Italy had economically thrived while other had stagnated. The
justification given for the discernible variance between the north and south of Italy, is that the regions in the north are economically prosperous due to the existence of robust norms of reciprocity and thick networks of civic participation that make collaboration possible contrary to communities in the southern regions (Kimuyu, 2000).

Bazan and Schmitz (1997) agree with Putnam (1993) findings on the variations in economic development between northern and southern regions of Italy by pointing out that the caliber of association between community members has a robust impact on investments and overall economic growth. Fukuyama (1999) observes that abundance in stocks of social capital gives rise to a vibrant civil society which fosters the efficiency in the operations of modern societies.

Narayan and Pritchett (1997) argue that availability of abundant stocks of social capital is a key feature in the performance of modern democracy. They highlight the different roles through which social capital can contribute to the improvement of social well-being and prosperity. First, social capital reduces inefficiency in the delivery of services to the public and government operations. They explain that efficiency is achieved through increased levels of voluntary involvement and improvement in monitoring of services provided by the government. Second, abundant amounts of social capital may encourage growth of collaborative habits in the society. This would greatly contribute in addressing the problem of the tragedy of the commons through communal stewardship of common property. Tragedy of the commons is a situation in which multiple individuals, acting independently, and solely and rationally consulting their own self-interest, will ultimately destroy a shared limited resource even when it is clear that it is not in anyone's long-term
interest for this to happen. Thus social capital would lead to efficient utilization of 
community resources for the benefit of all and sundry.

Narayan and Pritchett (1997) further argue that affiliation to highly interconnected 
organizations has a positive relationship with fast adoption of inventions. New ideas, 
innovations and discoveries may permeate communities with higher social capital at a 
faster rate, thus attaining greater economic growth and prosperity. For instance, Isham 
(1999; 2002) shows that social capital influenced the adoption of improved seeds and 
application of fertilizer among the rural households in Tanzania.

Social capital has also been extensively applied in explaining neighborhood improvement 
and social cohesion within the broader society especially in respect to the underprivileged 
and marginalized regions (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Green et al. 2005). For instance, 
Lang and Hornburg (1998) assert that programs of neighborhood improvement are more 
viable in communities with sufficient amount of social capital.

Woolcock and Narayan (2000) note that being a member of a social network and 
associating with others in the community has prospects for procuring socioeconomic 
benefits to the member and also to the entire community. In addition, societies with 
abundant social capital are perceived to be well placed in dealing with vulnerability and 
poverty and that the opposite is true.

Research at the grassroots level has assessed the influence of social capital on household 
income. Narayan and Pritchett (1997) identified social capital as among the most 
important determining factors of households’ income in rural Tanzania. The villages
with adequate social capital in the form of reciprocity and sharing of information were found to have a greater likelihood of adopting modern and improved farming practices, utilization of credit for agricultural improvement and accessing improved public services.

More research has been done examining the effect of social capital in obtaining employment and its impact on professional growth. It is reported that social capital does not only enable workers obtain employment but it also positively influences career growth and success (Granovetter, 1973; 1995; Lin and Dumin, 1996; Lin, Ensel and Vaughn, 1981; Burt, 1992; Padolny and Baron, 1997; Gabbay and Zuckerman, 1998).

Social capital is also very useful particularly in organizational growth and development through creation of intellectual capital between and among organizations (Hargadon and Sutton, 1997; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) and also in facilitating exchange of resources and product innovation between firms (Gabbay and Zuckerman, 1998; Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998). Other studies argue that social capital reduces the rate of turnover and rates of organizational dissolution as well as facilitating development of new forms of association, innovative organization and start-up companies (Krackhardt and Hanson, 1993; Pennings, Lee and Van Witteloostuijin, 1998; Walker, Kogut, and Shan, 1997).

In Kenya, social capital has had an instrumental impact in the formation of various groups such as agricultural marketing groups, land buying groups, housing groups, sand harvesting groups, handcraft and fisheries among others (Republic of Kenya, 2002). The overall effect of these groups and organizations is improved livelihood of the rural people.
Social capital since independence in 1963 has been the key driver in the development of education in Kenya (Coleman and Hoffer, 1987; Francis, 1998). The success of *Harambee* (community-based) secondary school project is largely attributed to the willingness of the community members to come together and take charge of educating their children. To come up with the *Harambee* schools, it involved fundraising and physical participation of all members of the community, an exercise that would have been in futile if social capital was not abundant. According to Rugh and Bossert (1998), the *Harambee* learning centres developed spontaneously in form of grassroots initiatives in the community with the view to enhancing greater access to secondary education than what the government could provide.

### 2.4.1 Dysfunctions of Social Capital on Social Welfare

In the context of this study, understanding the dysfunctions i.e. the negative effects of social capital is critical because it provides a framework for analyzing its impact which could be either positive or negative on the resettlement process and to the lives of the affected population. The experiences of the poor as described from different countries by Narayan *et al.* (2000) emphasize the importance of kinship networks for daily survival and for crisis management. However, despite the numerous gains derived from social capital, there are also problems associated with it. Hence social capital is a two-way street with both positive and negative outcomes. In some instances, it can be used to deny others resources and opportunities and in other cases it can be instrumental in facilitating access to vital resources.

Di Falco and Bulte (2011) argue that unlike friendship networks, which are typically voluntary and based on reciprocity, kinship relations may impose obligations on its
members. This is synonymous with ‘affective economy’ or what Scott (1976) and Platteau (1991) term as ‘moral economy’ of societies. Generally, members of a kinship network are morally obligated to support and claim assistance from their fellow kinsmen in dealing with difficulties. These claims may be detrimental to individual’s success. Narayan et al. (2000) points out that it is difficult for people in Mali to create wealth and accumulate assets at the individual or household level because of the claims made to those assets by other kinship members.

Similarly, Di Falco and Bulte (2011) conclude that the prospect of forced redistribution may impact on spending and savings decisions. Narayan et al. (2000) in a study of communities in Mali observed that the reciprocal ties have an extreme effect on fertility decisions. For example, if a couple plans to have few children so that they can save on the family resources, they may be compelled by the reciprocal norms to take over the responsibility of taking care of other relatives’ children; a behavior that discourages savings, productive investments and small family size.

Coleman (1988) also argues that social capital does not only facilitate certain actions, but it also constrains others. For example, members of a particular group or community with strong and effective norms may have advantages in the labor market because they have a large stock of ties that can be used to obtain jobs or other resources at the expense of other groups or communities without such strong ties. Hence social capital can constrain efforts to address poverty and social inequalities in the society.
2.5 Sustainability of Social Capital

The role of social capital in both economic and social development has in recent years received increasing attention, from academics and policy makers (Grootaert et al. 2002). Therefore, it is important to examine the factors that influence its sustainability. Knowledge on sustainability of social capital would be useful in providing policymakers, Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), and communities with better empirical information that will help them design and implement more effective strategies for harnessing sustainable social capital.

According to Grootaert et al. (2004), development and maintenance of social capital is determined by the ability of community members to associate with each other and to forge linkages with other communities as well as other members belonging to their networks who do not reside in their community. Narayan et al. (2000) contends that social capital is maintained by social cohesion which they define as the “connectedness among individuals and social groups that facilitates collaboration and equitable resource distribution at the household, community and state level” (Narayan et al. 2000, 220).

Indeed, Grootaert et al. (2004) argue that the level of peaceful coexistence and inclusivity is one of the most important and positive manifestation of social capital in a community. Therefore, a socially cohesive society is one that is characterized by intense social interaction. Thus, in their conceptualization of social capital, Grootaert et al. (2004) identify collective action and cooperation as important factors in the maintenance of social capital.
The basic reasoning by Grootaert et al. (2004) is that social action is only possible where there are significant stocks of social capital. They also point out that the positive manifestation of a high level of social capital in the community is the occurrence of frequent every-day social interactions. This can take the form of meetings with people in public places, visits to other people’s homes or visits from others into one’s own home, and participation in community events such as sports or ceremonies.

Common to both the literature on collective action and social capital is the view that polarization inhibits the development of relationships of trust (Hoddinott, 2002). Trust, built up by repeated interactions, is widely viewed as a key indicator of social capital. Easterly and Levine (1997, p. 1205-6) say, “Polarized communities will be prone to competitive rent-seeking by different groups and have difficulty agreeing on public goods like infrastructure thereby impede agreement about the provision of public goods”.

Heterogeneity and group participation in connection to sustainability of social capital have also received increasing attention in recent years. For instance, Alesina and La Ferrara (2000) analyzed the impact of racial, ethnic and income heterogeneity on individual’s proclivity to join socio-political associations in the United States of America (USA) and found that it has negative effect. On the other hand, La Ferrara (2001) investigates the role of wealth inequality in villages where people have the choice of joining groups that provide different net benefits to the rich and the poor, and shows that when access is unrestricted, higher village inequality results to lower participation because the relatively rich opt out of the groups. This suggests that in order to enhance and sustain social capital, it is important to reduce the inequality gap in the society.
Miguel (2000) and Gugerty and Miguel (2001) address the issue of heterogeneity by analyzing the effect of ethnic diversity on school funding and school organization in Kenyan villages. Both studies find that ethnic fragmentation is associated with worse outcomes.

Gugerty and Miguel (2001) in particular, find that the more racially heterogeneous the pupils’ population, the lower are parental participation in school activities, school committee attendance and teacher attendance and motivation. Memberships in local associations and networks have also been viewed as important in the maintenance of social capital. For instance, Grootaert et al. (2004) argue that the local associations and networks are the conduits through which social capital is built and accumulated.

2.6 Attributes and Measurements of Social Capital
The use of the term ‘capital’ in describing social capital is a deliberate attempt by sociologists to call attention to those attributes of social relationships that are analogous to physical and human capital, in the same way this term is used by economists. Despite having important aspects that distinguish it as true capital, there is inconsistency in the views as to whether issues discussed under social capital can be understood as true ‘capital’.

Samuelson (1976), a classical elementary economist stated that capital is an input to economic production, which is differentiated from other inputs such as land and labor by the fact that a capital input is itself an output of a prior productive process. In this sense, modern economists such as Grootaert et al. (2004) contend that social capital, just like other inputs of economic production, has many aspects of capital.
In line with Samuelson’s (1976) argument, a social capital resource is also an output of prior human action and that it requires resources to produce, in particular time. According to Coleman (1990) it can either accumulate or decrease contingent on the dynamics of relations among persons. For example when a couple weds, several changes in the relations among persons result because both couples expand the number of relationships by including members of the opposite family into their social network.

Another inference from Samuelson’s definition of capital and Grootaert and van Bastelaer (2002) assertion that social capital is real capital with input and output sides, is that it consists of relationships that are themselves actually or potentially productive (Bourdieu, 1986). This implies that social capital can contribute to the achievement of certain ends. For example, in the two sides of social capital’s input and output, the input dimension reflects the investment needed to produce a durable asset(s) while the output side represents the emerging ability to produce many positive outcomes which could be of varied forms such as enhanced access to information, access to loans, education, health and other essential services.

Other attributes of social capital are discussed by Astone et al. (1999) in the context of capital resources include the property of alienability. Economists distinguish between resources that may be exchanged with another person and those that may not. The ability to exchange is referred to as alienability or transferability. Like human capital, but unlike most forms of physical capital, social capital is not completely transferable (Astone et al. 1999; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998).
Astone et al. (1999) further argued that social capital has the property of depreciation. This suggests that if social capital is not maintained just like human and physical capital, it will depreciate. Therefore, it means effort is required to maintain relationships otherwise the value of social capital will depreciate. Coleman (1990) and Astone et al. (1999) talked of fungibility as a property of capital resources. Fungibility is the ability of a resource to be used in a variety of ways. Coleman (1990) argued that just like physical capital and human capital, social capital is not totally fungible; it is only fungible with respect to certain activities.

Kirori (2009) argues that social capital is created and activated by a minimum of two persons while other forms of capital are potentially productive in one-man economy. Also unlike physical capital but like human capital, social capital can accumulate with its use. Measurements of social capital are contextual. Social capital is concerned with the social relations and the resources that can benefit people irrespective of whether they part of organized networks i.e. when the free-rider tendencies are disregarded.

Therefore, when measuring social capital and particularly in the context of this study, measures associated with social relations including participation in community work, those associated with trust and trustworthiness, social support and cohesion, collective action and co-operation, information sharing and communication serve as important proxy indicators of social capital. These indicators are selected because of their broad application in explaining people’s state of their well-being (Berkman, 1995; Hyypa and Maki, 2003; Putnam, 2000; Szreter and Woolcock, 2004).
Literature has demonstrated that network and group membership is important for both social and economic development. It has demonstrated that social relations and interactions are important for the enhancement of people’s well-being. According to Blomkvist (2001) information on groups and networks can effectively enable an individual to measure the volume of social capital present in the community. Hence associational membership and the interaction taking place in such groups and networks should be considered in the measurement of social capital.

According to Putnam (2001) the levels of trust present in the community may serve as an important proxy indicator of social capital. Thus, it is necessary that the levels of trust are taken into consideration in measuring social capital. Trust, though very subjective, may be defined as the expectation that individuals will act and behave in accordance to the manner expected of them. Trust is considered an important factor in facilitating cooperation amongst individuals, as well as a cementing bond in social relationships. Hence, when incorporating trust in the measurement of social capital, the perceived trustworthiness of others should be taken into account.

There are usually two dimensions of trust that are often considered in the measurement of social capital; the generalized trust and particularized trust. Generalized trust is broader in the sense that it involves the extent to which people generally believe that other citizens can be trustworthy. It does not therefore demand the prior knowledge of the trustee. Russell (2000) argues that such trust is often associated with institutions and is often understood to refer to trust in institutions. The underlying understanding is that institutions such as welfare, service and legal institutions are responsive to people’s needs and that people will trust them. Particularized trust exists between people who are well
familiar with each other for some time. It is an outcome of regular face-to-face interaction. Such trust can also be facilitated by social norms in the society.

Collective action is a critical indicator of social capital (Grootaert et al. 2004). The significance of collective action as a pointer of social capital is derived from the logic that in many communities social action is only possible when a considerable amount of social capital is present. However, Grootaert et al. (2004) points out that the major exception occurs in totalitarian societies where governments can force people to work together on infrastructure projects or other types of common activities. Collective action as an indicator of social capital focuses fundamentally on three main aspects: the extent of collective action, the types of activities undertaken collectively and the overall willingness to cooperate and participate in collective action.

The focus on information and communication as a basic indicator of social capital is important because it facilitates the assessment of the relative value of groups and networks as sources of crucial information. Information is also considered as a vital tool for the generation of income and/or other aspects of well-being (Grootaert et al. 2004).

Huge amount of social capital in any given society is often manifested by the incidence of regularized day-to-day interactions. Interactions may range from networking with other people in public places, home visits, or being visited by others and involvement in the community wide events such as ceremonies and sports. Diversity of the membership of associations mirrors the internal disunity or unity of community members and by extension the various forms of social capital present (Grootaert et al. 2004).
2.7 Summary of Literature Review

The available literature on social capital and resettlement of displaced populations is robust. However, it is more inclined towards the welfare of refugees as opposed to that of internally displaced persons. For example, the available literature highlights that refugees are highly exposed to social, political, and economic forces that exacerbate their vulnerability. It further points out that refugees engage in successful coping strategies that enable them to become more resilient, thereby reducing their level of vulnerability as well as influencing their resettlement. In the resettlement process, a commonly seen adaptation strategy among the refugees is utilizing community linkages and social connections otherwise known as social capital. On the contrary, literature is silent on the impact of social capital on the resettlement of internally displaced persons. Therefore, the need to fill this lacuna in knowledge.

Literature further acknowledges the multifaceted nature of social capital because it is characterized by differing relationship dynamics. Literature has revealed that connections defining social capital are now categorized as either bonding, bridging, or linking social capital. However, whereas this categorization is important, there is a gap in the literature as to which form of social capital is more important in facilitating the resettlement of IDPs. Also, studies reviewed in the literature have not analyzed the factors responsible for the creation of social capital particularly among the IDPs.

Social capital has also been portrayed in the literature as a critical asset for enhancing social welfare and social development particularly among the poor households and communities. The problem with this kind of generalization is that it may obscure the actual role of social capital among special groups such as IDPs because of the
relationship dynamism between the IDPs and the host communities and between themselves. Therefore, this warrants the need to conduct an empirical investigation specifically on how social capital influences the resettlement of IDPs. The reviewed literature has also identified the key indicators commonly used in the measurement of social capital. Those relevant for this study include participation in social networks, trust and trustworthiness, social support and cohesion, and collective action and cooperation.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This section provides the theoretical perspectives used in this study. Three theories, namely; social networks theory, collective action theory and rational choice theory have been used. The three theories provide the most appropriate analytical framework and knowledge on the importance of social networks and collective action in relation to the resettlement of IDPs.

2.8.1 Social Network Theory

This study adopted the social network theory to understand the role of social capital on the resettlement of the internally displaced persons in Kenya. The initial thoughts of social network can be traced in the work of the founding fathers of sociology such as Emile Durkheim and Ferdinand Tonnies. However, later, Granovetter (1973) and Wellman (1983) elaborated and popularized the idea of social network analysis.

According to State (2008) social networks are ties between close associates, organizations and groups who share commonalities such as economic, social or cultural activities, traits and are not doubtful of the others. State’s definition tends to describe the close-knit networks involving informal bonds of friendship. Essentially, social network
theory helps in assessing the value of social relationships in improving individuals, organizations or groups’ well-being. The theory views social relationships in terms of ‘nodes’ and ‘ties’. Nodes are the members in the network and ties are the connections between the members.

The theory argues that there can be many kinds of connections between the actors. Hence social network theory is a map of all the relevant ties between nodes. Thus, the network theory can be used to determine the amount of social capital of autonomous individual actors. Wellman (1983) observes that the network theory focuses more on social connections between actors who are densely connected than on social groups and social categories.

According to Boissevain (1985) there are different levels under which networks can clearly be understood. These are based on the interaction attributes of networks which involve the nature of exchanges between them, commitment and involvement that takes place within the network interaction such as direction, frequency and duration of the relationship. Hence according to Boissevain (1985) interaction in networks can take two main forms: multiplex and simplex interactions. These levels are closely similar to Granovetter’s (1973) argument that social relationships can be classified as either strong or weak. Simply defined when the relationship is multiplex rather than simplex, the connections are weak but could as well be stable and long lasting.

According to Granovetter (1973) weak social ties are developed through a small number of interactions with peers across more distant and separate clusters. In contrast, the simplex relationships are the stable and strong ties that are typically personal connections
that are linked to a given person(s) contact and ego (Boissevain 1968). Gronnovetter (1973) argues that the strong ties, just like in Boissevain classification of simplex ties, require substantial personal investment and therefore tend to manifest through close personal relationships.

In simplex networks or strong ties, there are informal bonds of friendship that are maintained by friendly relationships and facilitation of close communication and sharing of information among members. Consequently, a social structure is established within the social network and every member is obliged to conform to the norms governing the social structure. The norms facilitate the development of intimate feelings and a feeling of interdependence among the members of the network such that if one member of the network is affected, then everyone in the network is also affected. Hence there is a mutual type of relationship where the members voluntarily provide assistance and support to one another. This behavior is responsible for the stability of the network.

The determinants for the development of simplex or strong ties are homogeneity of the network constituents. That is, they must be brought together by certain commonalities such as ancestral or kinship lineage, sharing of similar geographical locality, economic, social or cultural activities, ethnicity, common history, and above all must trust one another. In these types of dense relationships, it is assumed that strong reciprocal rights and mutual obligations for mutual assistance exist for the benefit of every member. Kenis and Knoke (2002) noted that a social structure whose members exchange information freely in both directions enables new information to spread quickly and reliably through the system, thus making members enjoy greater capacity to obtain opportunities for forging additional relationships and benefits.
The reciprocal patterns in a relationship account for the stability and maintenance of the network. The acts of providing help to another come with an expectation that the recipient will also at some point feel indebted and would voluntarily pay back either in the same measure or in a different way. From the economics point of view, the gestures of goodwill that are received by a needy person from a member of the network are analogous to the ‘credit slips’ or ‘chits’ (Coleman, 1988; Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993).

It is argued that it is the amount of the credit slips possessed that compels one to participate in the relationship with others. Such relationships are maintained by the principle of homophily and trust (McPherson et al. 1992). Hence the claim that people that are similar or share many common similarities; and are too familiar with each other are more likely to engage in reciprocal interactions. This does not, however, suggest that the propensity to service the ‘debts’ may not be abused by some members by failing to reciprocate either as a result of lack of ability to do so or due to unwillingness to do good to others. In such cases, then the credit slips possessed may be equated to bad debts. This phenomenon rarely occurs in close-knit networks due to informal pressure exerted to individual towards normative consensus.

The focus of social network theory is fundamentally the content and quality of social networks and the actual or prospective benefits that individuals derive from membership into a social network. The quality of a social network is defined based on norms of trust, reciprocity, and communication and sharing of information, and whether the network is based on strong or weak ties. Hence the social network theory would be very appropriate in this study to help determine the outcomes of social capital in the resettlement of IDPs.
in Kenya. Social network theory or analysis is used on various levels of analysis, from families, organizations, up to level of nations. It can be applied to determine the way problems are solved; organizations are run, and the degree to which individuals succeed in achieving their goals.

OCHA Kenya (2009) reported that, in 2009, at least eighteen self-help groups comprising of 6,711 families of IDPs had been formed. The development of self-help groups can be as a result of the existence or construction of new social networks among IDPs. Hence, the social networks theory is relevant for this study. Its contribution lies in conceptualizing how social networks and their consequent role affect the resettlement of IDPs.

2.8.2 Theory of Collective Action

Collective action theory is premised on the organizational approach to remedies of community or neighborhood problems. It focuses on the circumstances in which social groups with a mutual interest recognize that interest and takes action to address it (Claque, 1997). Olson (1965) provides the initial theoretical framework on collective action but in the economic perspective. The fundamental proposition of collective theory is that collective action often results in the formation of community organizations which mobilize individuals with similar problems and aspirations and who cannot, single handedly, address those problems and achieve their aspirations effectively unless they organized themselves into groups.

The main argument in the formation of groups, is that they become medium of pooling resources, labor, and capital that enables members to access certain resources or perform
gainful activities, which otherwise if undertaken alone, would involve greater risk and effort. The underlying implication is that members must have a commonly agreed objectives as well as ways or strategies of achieving those objectives. The group also serves as a behavior control mechanism through the enforcement of group rules and norms that tend to sanction and overcome the free-rider tendencies. This is often attained by exerting pressure from the group and ensuring that the groups are relatively smaller in size. Olson (1965) suggests that if groups are larger in size, collective action becomes more difficult to organize.

The notion of social capital is closely related to collective action and can also be accepted as pointer of capacity for cooperative action. Ostrom et al. (1994) describes social capital as a multiplicity of networks of individuals and sets of shared norms entrenched in those networks. Hence it involves relationships of trust, mutual exchange, agreed upon guidelines and norms and sanctions which are vital for social capital development (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2004).

Ramos-Pinto (2006) argues that social capital engenders collective action. The features of social capital have great potential to make collective action highly possible. In some studies such as Fujiie et al. (2005), the concepts of collective action and social capital have been applied in economic studies to analyze factors influencing successful collective action at individual and group level.

The theory of collective action is used in this study because it is assumed that individuals experiencing difficulties to meet their needs, would be impelled by that inability to be involved in a collective initiative in order to reduce the risk and effort of doing it alone
and as a way of maximizing gains from the collective good. For example, it is assumed that through collective action, the IDPs would lower the cost of pursuing livelihood goals consequently reducing their level of vulnerability.

2.8.3 Rational Choice Theory

The basic tenets of the rational choice theory are derived from neoclassical economists as well as utilitarianism and game theory. Rational choice theory, also known as rational action theory, posits that social behaviour is guided by rational calculation of an exchange of rewards and costs. Akin to the economic calculations through which we determine whether the value (reward) of a good is worth its price (cost), so in our social interactions we decide to enter into or terminate a relationship (exchange) with another (Elster, 1986; Hechter, 1987; Hechter and Kanazawa, 1997; Whitmeyer and Cook, 2002; Spillman and Strand, 2013; Lara, 2015).

The main focus of the theory is on actors who are seen as being purposive. That is, they have goals towards which their actions are aimed. They also have preferences, utilities and values. The key authority in this theory is James Coleman following his publication on Foundations of Social Theory in 1990. Apart from Coleman (1990), sociologist George C. Homans (1961), has also arguably made the most significant contributions to rational choice theory.

The central ideas of rational choice theory further led to the development of social exchange theory; both (rational choice theory and exchange theory) of which form a distinct approach to understanding social life. For example, Homans (1961) and Blau (1964) depict individuals as rational and strategic actors who utilize the resources they
have at their disposal in bid to optimize their benefits. Hence, their position that, individuals are driven to act not on the basis of tradition, unconscious drives, or some type of structural imperative, but rather on the basis of rational considerations: namely, evaluating the consequences of other forms of conduct in terms of the “profit” they will likely generate. Thus, following the economic model, rational choice theorists view social interaction as a process of social exchange.

According to Coleman (1990), rational choice theory has two basic elements: actors and resources. Resources are those things over which actors have control and in which they have some interests. Coleman (1990) observes that the interaction of the two elements leads to the system level. Hence, “a minimal basis for social system of action is two actors, each having control over resources of interest to the other. It is each one’s interest in resources under the other’s control that leads the two, as purposive (rational) actors, to engage in actions that involve each other…a system of action… It is this structure, together with the fact that the actors are purposive, each having the goal of maximizing the realization of his/her interests, that give the interdependence or systemic character to their actions” (Coleman, 1990:29).

Within sociological theory, rational choice theorists such as Hechter (1987); Hindess (1988); Scott, (1995) while emphasizing the strategic decisions of individuals, are more inclined to situate such decisions within the context of group dynamics. Thus, rational choice theorists explore how interaction between rationally motivated individuals can produce norms, networks, control of resources, and group solidarity, as well as how these factors, once created, orient or constrain individuals’ decisions and behavior.
Within the rational choice theory, basic concepts that explain and predict not only individual decision making and behavior, but also the formation of groups and the conditions that enable and influence individual and group decision making are elaborated. Trust is one such concept; according to Coleman (1990: 192) “actors place trust, in both the judgment and performance of others, based on rational considerations of what is best, given the alternatives they confront”. The alternatives for possible rewards that an individual has at his disposal are determined by the people with whom he associates.

The importance of trust in this context is to ensure that the associates are able to reap possible future benefits that come with establishing a reputation of trustworthiness. It for instance determines whether a neighbour is willing to lend his/her fellow neighbour some money to be returned at a later date. The decision to place trust in another involves rational calculations. It entails knowing how much will be lost by trusting the other and how much can be gained and the likelihood of winning of course depending on the information one has at his/her disposal.

Norms is another concept that underlies the rational choice theory. They refer to socially defined informal rights to control the actions of others. Like trust, Coleman (1990) sees norms emerging on the basis of actors’ rational considerations. More specifically, they develop out of repeated and regularized exchanges between a limited numbers of individuals who have an interest in maintaining a relationship with one another, for example, a self-help group.

The norms that emerge are not assumed to be universally shared across a society, but instead are applicable only to those individuals involved in the relationship. Decisions to
adhere to and enforce norms, like those that led to their initial emergence, are conditioned by the relative costs and benefits derived from doing so. Norms are essentially intended to encourage behavior that produces positive consequences and to discourage behavior that produces negative consequences.

Adherence to norms can only be sustained when certain conditions are fulfilled. First, when the parties subjected to them are positively rewarded by the beneficiaries for their compliance. Secondly, when they are negatively rewarded (punished) by the beneficiaries for being involved or conducting themselves in a manner judged improper. Thirdly, when the parties have assimilated the demand and thus regulate their behaviour by experiencing intrinsically generated rewards for behaving in accordance with the demand.

Fourthly, the parties are well aware of the demand and thus regulate their conduct by experiencing internally generated punishments for violating the social imperatives. Eventually, it is the sanctions attached to norms that provide the basis for individuals to relinquish some of their rights and coordinate their activities with others in the pursuit of collective goals. With the emergence and realization of norms, group relations and the patterning of behavior that reinforces norms can be sustained over time while limiting wholly self-interested and potentially socially destructive conduct.

The third concept that Coleman (1990) turned his attention to in examining the relationship between individual decisions and group action is that of the free-rider. This refers to the individual’s rational decision not to be involved in group activity if the goals of the group or the goods it produces cannot be denied to the individual and if their supply is not reduced by others consuming them. For example, in the context of this
study an internally displaced person deciding to deliberately not to participate in the building of a classroom within their neighborhood. Such behaviour can only be sanctioned by applying norms that discourage the free-rider tendencies. In conclusion, rational choice theory sees actors as choosing those actions that will maximize utility or the satisfaction of their needs.

Basic to the three theories used in this study, that is, the social network theory, collective action theory and rational choice theory is the assumption that complex social phenomena, including the focus of this study, can be explained in terms of the elementary individual actions of which they are composed. Hence, to explain social organization and social change including the role of social capital in the resettlement of internally displaced persons is to show how they arise as a result of the action and interaction of individuals.

2.9 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a virtual or written product that explains either graphically or in narrative form, the main variables or constructs to be investigated in a study (Mathieson, Peacock and Chin, 2001). It includes the key factors, concepts or variables and their presumed relationships among them. Stratman and Roth (2004) explains that conceptual frameworks are structured from a set of broad ideas and theories that enable researchers to properly identify the problem to be investigated, frame their questions and identify the suitable methods of data collection and analysis.

A conceptual framework is important in academic research because it helps the researcher to clarify his/her research questions and purpose. Therefore, it forms the bases
upon which the specific research questions that drive the study are investigated. Hence, it
directs the collection and analysis of data. A conceptual framework was adopted in this
study to describe the relationship between the various components of social capital and
how they contribute to the resettlement of IDPs.
**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**

### Independent variables

Determinants of social capital:
- Individual/Household factors
  - Age
  - Sex/gender
  - Marital status
  - Employment status
  - Income

Community/neighborhood factors:
- Trust and trustworthiness
- Sense of security
- Collective action and cooperation
- Social cohesion and inclusion

- Community groups
- Social networks and associations

### Dependent variable

Social capital:
- Bonding
- Bridging
- Linking

Sustainable resettlement of IDPs:
- Better housing and sanitation
- Sustainable business establishments
- Sustainable agriculture
- Access to social services
- Social cohesion and integration

### Intervening variables

- Government social welfare programs
- NGOs’ support
- Corporates’ social responsibility
- Support from FBOs
Figure 2.1 illustrates that household level characteristics and community or neighborhood level characteristics are important predictors of social capital. Household characteristics influence participation which is a vital component in the creation of social capital especially through the use of voluntary organizations. While the conceptual framework outlines the process of achieving sustainable resettlement of IDPs, empirical literature suggests that individual characteristics such as education, employment, age, income, gender and marital status contribute to the formation of social capital (Brehn and Rahn, 1997; Glaeser et al. 2000).

Similarly, there are a number of community level factors that need to be considered in the assessment of the role of social capital in the resettlement of IDPs. For example, empirical literature suggests that density of group membership, households’ perception of safety in the community, and the degree of trust among community members have an effect on the stock of social capital available in the community (Hankasson and Snehota, 1995).

The social network theory, collective action theory, rational choice theory and the conceptual framework, relate to each other closely in the sense that in all of them social capital is seen as a class of resources obtainable by individuals and families through formal and informal associations. Social capital is viewed as an important asset that enables individuals and households to achieve certain ends that otherwise would be difficult pursued based on individual strategies.
2.10 Operational Definition of Variables

In order to understand the role of social capital in the resettlement of internally displaced persons in Kenya; five conceptual aspects were referred to, namely: factors contributing to the formation of social capital; forms of social capital; impact of social capital on households’ welfare; sustainability of social capital; and resettlement of internally displaced persons. The first four conceptual aspects form the independent variables while the fifth aspect is the dependent variable. These aspects are elaborated in the following sections.

2.10.1 Factors Contributing to the Formation of Social Capital

Within the literature, there are several potential factors that influence the development of social networks in a given community and by consequence determines the formation of social capital. Gittel and Vidal (1998); Putnam (2001); and Durston (2004) emphasizes on community level factors such as diverse forms of civic engagement or actors’ shared history and culture as factors influencing the formation of social capital. On the other hand, Hoffer et al. (1999); Glaeser (2001); and Lin (2001) emphasize instead on actors’ socio-demographic characteristics such as age, sex, education, and income.

In this study, household/individual and community level characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, employment status, and income and trust and trustworthiness, sense of security, collective action and collaboration, social cohesion and inclusion respectively (demographic and social characteristics) were used as indicators for the determinants of social capital. In order to generate precise and generalizable data on these aspects, quantitative methods were used.
2.10.2 Forms of Social Capital

In the contemporary academic literature, social capital is discussed not as a single entity, but rather as multi-dimensional in character (Grootaert et al. 2004). As a result, different categories of social capital have been developed. The categorization is based along the kind of groups and connections that impoverished people call upon, and the type and level of their assistance toward others, their groups and networks. This determines the organization of a given group in terms of forms of interaction and the frequency of interaction (Grootaert et al. 2004). The structure of the network has major implications on the flow of resources through that network. Following such a conceptualization, three types of networks namely local networks, external networks and vertical networks were examined in order to establish the various forms of social capital present in the community studied.

Local networks or connections were used as an indicator of social relationships within the community. These are connections that group members or households could reach out for various forms of support including but not limited to credit, productive assets, information, and material support during emergencies among others. Local networks reflected the scope of local relationships that could enhance the actors’ ability to accumulate economic capital. This indicator represents the “bonding” form of social capital which is essentially connections to people who are alike demographically and socially (Grootaert et al. 2004).

External connections referred to the actors’ connections or interactions with people or groups who lived outside the village. These are the groups or social networks with which households interacted with on regular basis on a number of concerns such as obtaining
technical information, accessing productive assets or to receive material support during emergencies. External connections according to Grootaert et al. (2004) characterization represent “bridging” form of social capital which is basically connections to people with different demographic and social characteristics (Gittell and Vidal, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Narayan, 2002). Just as the name indicates, bridging social capital is basically horizontal. It connects people of more or less equal statuses.

Vertical connections referred to connections with people in authority. These are social ties between clients and providers who are viewed as important conduits for delivering essential services. These ties constitute “linking” form of social capital which according to Narayan (2000) is pivotal in promoting well-being of people living in poor counties characterized by weak institutions and corrupt systems. This was assessed by asking respondents whether they interacted with people in authority such as the police, political leaders, local government officials, and central government officials.

To generate data on the forms of social capital, a mixture of methods involving both quantitative and qualitative methods was used. Qualitative method was applied to gain deeper understanding particularly on the patterns of interactions at different levels between the groups within the same community and also with those outside the community. The quantitative approach was on the other hand applied to gain understanding on the frequency of interaction between different groups.

2.10.3 Social Capital and Household Welfare

This aspect examined the impact of social capital in generating prospects for improving other aspects of well-being such as access to health care and education. Impact in this
study refers to the significant changes observed in the household according to whether households had access to randomly listed set of economically relevant forms of support from social networks. Thus the key indicators were the resources of economic importance obtained by the households from social networks and/or associations. The indicators for this variable were the type of support and assets derived from the associations and networks to the household. Data on household welfare was captured by administering the questionnaires and conducting focus group discussions around the specific indicators.

2.10.4 Sustainability of Social Capital
This was examined through sociability and engagement. The indicators included frequency of interaction and communication with other members of the community, actors’ willingness to co-operate and participate in community activities, actors’ willingness to align their personal interests with those of the community, and the likelihood of being sanctioned for free-riding and malfeasance. This was achieved by administering the questionnaire to the individual respondent and also by conducting focus group discussions.

2.10.5 Resettlement of IDPs
This variable was measured through the levels of resettlement and integration in the community. Resettlement was grouped into three main categories namely; fully settled, not fully settled and not settled at all. The indicators of level of resettlement were the quality of shelter in terms of the type of building materials for the wall, roof and floor, type of toilet used (sanitation) and the source of water for drinking and domestic use, livelihood indicators, while the extent of involvement in community activities, sense of community, and safety were the indicators of integration.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methods adopted in this study. These include a description of the research design, study site and the rationale for its selection, the sampling procedure employed, nature and type of data, methods of data collection and data analysis techniques used.

3.2 Research Design

This study employed survey design because the information gathered required personal characteristics and perceptions of respondents. A survey requires a representative sample that reflects major characteristic of the population one would want to represent. Hence the observation units are selected in a way that ensures unbiased representation of the population of interest.

3.3 The Study Area and Rationale for Selection

This study was conducted in two counties Nakuru and Uasin Gishu. These are counties that had over the years experienced the impact of severe tribal clashes resulting in multitude of IDPS. Nakuru is a cosmopolitan county that is inhabited by people from the various tribes in Kenya. However, the Kikuyu and Kalenjin comprise the biggest proportion of the population. Other communities are represented by the migrant workers (Constitution and Reform Education Consortium, 2012). On the other hand, the population of Uasin Gishu comprises mainly of the members of the Kalenjin (Nandi, Kipsigis, Keiyos, Marakwets) community. The county is also inhabited by other communities such as the Luhya, Kikuyu, Kisii and Luo among others (CRECO, 2012)
3.3.1 Nakuru County

According to the Nakuru County Integrated Development Plan 2013-2017, Nakuru County is one of the 47 counties of the Republic of Kenya provided in the Constitution of Kenya 2010. The county lies within the Great Rift Valley and borders eight other counties namely; Kericho and Bomet to the west, Baringo and Laikipia to the north, Nyandarua to the east, Narok to the south-west and Kajiado and Kiambu to the south. The county covers an area of 7,495.1 Km² and is located between Longitude 35° 28` and 35° 36` East and Latitude 0° 13 and 1° 10` south. The county headquarters is Nakuru Municipality which was previously the headquarters of Rift Valley Province provided for in the old constitution until 4\textsuperscript{th} August 2010.

The main topographic features in Nakuru County are the Mau Escarpment covering the Western part of the county, the Rift Valley floor, Ol Doinyo Eburru Volcano, Akira plains, Menengai Crater, elaborate drainage and relief system and the various inland lakes on the floor of the Rift Valley where nearly all the permanent rivers and streams in the county drain into. These rivers include river Njoro, Makalia which drain into Lake Nakuru, Malewa which drains into Lake Naivasha and Molo River which drains into Lake Baringo among others. The most predominant is the Hells gate gorges in Naivasha which are an important tourist sites. The land topography in Naivasha and Gilgil Sub-Counties is characterized by mountain ranges and savannah vegetation cover that support various species of wildlife.

The county has a robust ecological system that the residents depend on for agriculture, tourism, water and many other benefits. The Mau Escarpment with an average altitude of 2,400m above sea level is very important as most of the forests are located on it. It is also
the source of Njoro River that drains into Lake Nakuru which is inhabited with flamingos, making it one of the premium tourist attraction sites in Kenya.

The forests in Nakuru County namely; Menengai Crater, Mbogoini, Solai, Mau, Bahati, Subukia, Eburru and Dundori are a major source of timber and firewood as well as providing employment to high number of the county population. The same forests generate income for the government in form of revenue from saw millers. The forest and the high altitude also influence climate condition in the county resulting to wet conditions suitable for agro-based economic activities. The climatic conditions are also favourable for micro-organisms that catalyse the decomposition of organic matter thereby enriching the soil that supports agricultural activities especially dairy and crop farming enabling the county to be almost food sufficient. Mau forest is also home to the indigenous Ogiek community. Underground hot springs in OlKaria are an important source of geothermal power that serves not only the county but also provides power supply to the national grid. Further explorations are underway at Menengai Crater and Ol Doinyo Eburru with a view to generating more electricity.

The climate of Nakuru County is strongly influenced by the altitude and physical features. There are three broad climatic zones (II, III and IV). Zone II covers areas with an altitude between 1980 and 2700 m above the sea level and receives minimum rainfall of 1000mm per annum. This zone covers Upper Subukia, Rongai and Mau Escarpment. Zone III receives rainfall of between 950 and 1500 mm per annum and covers areas with an altitude of between 900-1800m above sea level. This zone covers most parts of the county and is the most significant for agricultural cultivation. Zone IV occupies more or
less the same elevation (900-1800m) as Zone III. However, it has lower rainfall of about
500-1000mm per annum. This zone dominates Solai and Naivasha.

The county has a bimodal rainfall pattern. The short rains fall between October and
December while the long rains fall between March and May. Temperatures in the county
ranges from a high of 29.3°C between the months of December, January, February, and
part of early March to low temperatures of up to 12°C during the month of June and July.
Molo and Kuresoi Sub-Counties are relatively cold while Naivasha, Gilgil and parts of
Rongai Sub-County experience extreme hot weather. However with the deforestation
experienced in the county's forest blocks and influence from climate change, variant
rainfall patterns and higher temperatures may be experienced. Administratively, Nakuru
County comprise of eleven constituencies that include; Molo, Njoro, Naivasha, Gilgil,
Kuresoi South, Kuresoi North, Subukia, Rongai, Bahati, Nakuru Town West, and Nakuru
Town East.

3.3.2 Uasin Gishu County
Uasin Gishu County lies between longitudes 34º 50’ east and 35º 37’West and latitudes
0º 03’ South and 0º 55’ North. The county shares common borders with Trans Nzoia
County to the North, Elgeyo Marakwet County to the East, Baringo County to the South
East, Kericho County to the South, Nandi County to the South West and Kakamega
County to the North West. It covers a total area of 3,345.2 Sq. Km. (Uasin Gishu County

Uasin Gishu County is a highland plateau with altitudes falling gently from 2,700 metres
above sea level to about 1,500 metres above sea level. The topography is higher to the
east and declines gently towards the western border. The County is physiographically divided into three zones: the upper highlands, upper midlands and lower highlands. These zones greatly influence land use patterns as they determine the climatic conditions. The soils which comprise of red loam soils, red clay soils, brown clay soils and brown loam soils mainly support maize, sunflower, wheat, pyrethrum, potatoes and barley farming. They also support livestock rearing and forestry.

Uasin Gishu experiences high and reliable rainfall which is evenly distributed throughout the year. The average rainfall ranges between 624.9 mm to 1,560.4 mm with two distinct peaks occurring between March and September; and May and August. Dry spells occur between November and February. The temperatures range between 7 degrees Celsius and 29 degrees Celsius. Generally these conditions are favorable for livestock keeping, crop and fish farming. According to the 2009 Population and Housing Census, the total population of Uasin Gishu County stood at 894,179 with a population density of 267 persons per sq. Km. Administratively, Uasin Gishu County comprises of six constituencies namely; Soy, Turbo, Moiben, Ainabkoi, Kapseret, and Kesses constituencies.

From the foregoing information, it is evident that both Counties are high potential agricultural zones characterized by favorable weather with a good blend of rainfall and sunshine all year round. The good temperatures and rainfall combined with arable land influence agricultural activities in the two counties. This has made Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County to be the main agricultural and economic regions of the Kenyan Rift Valley. Large-scale farming and horticultural farming are the main agricultural activities
in the two areas although much of the agricultural activities are carried out on smallholder farms.

During the 2007/2008 post-election violence, both counties were some of the most affected regions in the country. The two counties have been experiencing volatile security situations especially since the re-introduction of multiparty politics in 1992 which resulted in ethnic clashes. The phenomenon of inter-ethnic conflict continued in the subsequent electoral periods with more devastating consequences. Violent evictions and involuntary flight of people became widespread as a result of ethnic clashes. In 2007, Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County experienced extreme political violence which led to large scale displacement of people more than in any other part in the country. This made the two counties to be the hosts of the largest number of IDPs in the country.

Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County are very similar in many aspects including ecological conditions and economic practices. The similarities of the two counties were considered important for this study in respect to maximizing the gathering of information on social capital building and mobilization in relation to resettlement of internally displaced persons. Moreover, it helped in ensuring a greater degree of validity of findings. It is against this backdrop that Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County were purposively identified as the sites for data collection.
Figure 3.2: Map of Kenya showing the study areas
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Figure 3.3: Map of Nakuru County with Constituencies

Source: ILRI GIS Portal (2007)
Figure 3.4: Map of Uasin Gishu County with constituencies

Source: ILRI GIS Portal (2007)
3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Multi-stage cluster sampling was used in this study because the geographical area of the two counties is very large making it too expensive, time-consuming and difficult to cover the entire area with random sampling (see the schematic flow of the sampling procedure in figure 3.4). According to Babbie (2005), cluster sampling may be employed when it is either impossible or impractical to compile an exhaustive list of the elements composing the target population. This method was appropriate for this particular study because household lists were not available for random sampling. Therefore, cluster sampling helped save time and resources because it required creating a list of households in the selected clusters rather than for all households in the entire population.

The multi-stage cluster sampling involved three stages. Constituencies in the selected counties comprised the first stage. The second stage consisted of the constituency assembly wards while the village units formed the third stage. In each county, five constituencies were selected using simple random sampling. This entailed listing all the constituencies in each county on small pieces of paper of equal size. The papers were then folded and put in a plate, stirred and picked at random. The picking was repeated five times without replacement. The same procedure was followed in the selection of constituency assembly wards and village units.

After selecting the constituency, the second step involved selecting the constituency assembly wards. In each constituency, two assembly wards were also randomly selected. Thus in every county, ten constituency assembly wards were selected. The third stage involved the village units in the identified constituency assembly wards. In each ward two village units were selected. Hence twenty village units were randomly selected in
each county. Once the village units were randomly identified, a list of households of victims of internal displacement was developed for each village with the help of the local administration (Assistant chief).

From every county 200 respondents were interviewed. Since there were 20 village units in every county, ten households were sampled from each village unit using systematic sampling. In order to completely eliminate bias in the selection of households, simple random sampling technique was used in identifying the first household. At the household level, the household head or in her/his absence an individual above the statutory age of the majority living in that household was interviewed. Other components of the sample included key informants who were purposively selected. They included four group leaders and four Chiefs. The key informants were selected on the account of their knowledge of internal displacement and the general community life in the area of study. Thus the actual number of respondents to whom structured questionnaires were administered was 400. The other eight (8) were the key informants. Here below is a sketch of the sampling procedure adopted for this study:
1. Defining all constituencies in each county as clusters

2. Defining all constituency assembly wards in each constituency as clusters

3. Defining all village units in each constituency assembly as clusters

4. Randomly selecting five constituencies (first level clusters) in each county.

5. Randomly selecting two constituency assembly wards from each of the five selected constituencies in each county

6. Randomly selecting two village units from each of the ten randomly selected constituency assembly wards in each county

7. Determining the number of households within each of the 20 selected village clusters in each county.

8. Selecting households within each cluster using systematic sampling.

9. Selecting one individual from the selected households using random sampling

Figure 3.5: Multi-stage Cluster Sampling Flow Chart
### Table 3.1: Randomly selected study areas in Nakuru County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Constituency Ward</th>
<th>Village Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molo</td>
<td>Mariashoni</td>
<td>Kiptunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ndosua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molo</td>
<td>Matumaini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kabianga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivasha</td>
<td>Biashara</td>
<td>Mununga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naivasha East</td>
<td>Munyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maraigushu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongai</td>
<td>Soin</td>
<td>Makutano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solai</td>
<td>Lower Solai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koisano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuresoi North</td>
<td>Sirikwa</td>
<td>Kotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirikwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamara</td>
<td>Mau Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sinendet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahati</td>
<td>Bahati</td>
<td>Wanyororo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bahati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dundori</td>
<td>Githiomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mugwathi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2: Randomly selected study areas in Uasin Gishu County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Constituency Ward</th>
<th>Village Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moiben</td>
<td>Moiben</td>
<td>Tachasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mumetet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tembelelo</td>
<td>Chepkosom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaplagoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy</td>
<td>Ziwa</td>
<td>Lolkinyei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirikwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soy</td>
<td>Kipsangui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaptat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapseret</td>
<td>Langas</td>
<td>Langas Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wareng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Kiambaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koibasui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesses</td>
<td>Racecourse</td>
<td>Oletebees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sosiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheptiret</td>
<td>Cheptiret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chuchumiat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbo</td>
<td>Kiplombe</td>
<td>Emgwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chebarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapsagoi</td>
<td>Kosachei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tiret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Unit of Analysis

Baker (1994) defines units of analysis as the social entities whose social characteristics are the focus of the proposed study. Therefore, the unit of analysis of this study is the individuals belonging to the households that had returned to their respective homes after displacement. The individuals included the head of the household. In situations where the head of the household was absent a re-visit to the same household was made. In the event of failure to interview the head of the household that was initially selected, a replacement with another household was done.

3.6 Unit of Observation

According to Singleton et al. (1993), units of observation are the subjects, items or entities from which we measure the characteristics or obtain the data required in the research study. In this study the units of observation were the sources of data that included the respondents, group leaders, and the community leaders at the local level (chiefs). At the respondents’ level, surveys were conducted to obtain information on socio-demographic data of household members: age, gender, level of education, income, marital status, and employment status.

The survey also obtained data on households’ affiliation to groups and social networks. In addition, information about the variety of resources of potential economic benefits that households had access to by virtue of belonging to a group or social networks was obtained. These resources were assumed to be instrumental in the resettlement process. To ascertain the instrumental value of those resources, the households’ material living conditions in terms of construction materials of their houses and the type of sanitary facility and the level of settlement were assessed.
The main issues addressed with key informants were the characteristics of social groups in terms of membership and the set of social relationships to which members could access social resources. These relationships include (i) relationships within the village (ii) relationships that connect beyond the local areas and (iii) those relationships that link with political authorities. These fit within the ‘bonding’, ‘bridging’ and ‘linking’ social capital classification. Other issues addressed with key informants were the impact of social capital on households’ welfare, sustainability of social capital and levels of settlement and integration.

3.7 Nature and Sources of Data

The data used in this study were both of quantitative and qualitative nature. The bulk of quantitative data were generated by administering questionnaires to the respondents while on the other hand qualitative data were generated through open-ended questions in the questionnaire as well as from in-depth interviews with key informants. Quantitative data aimed at capturing precise and general information on social capital, particularly with regard to variables such as gender, marital status, age, level of education, employment, income, group membership, and other variables that were deemed important in investigating the impact of social capital on the resettlement process.

On the other hand, qualitative data was generated to gain deeper analysis of the situation of IDPs and how their experiences in associational life influenced their resettlement. Since not much investigation has been undertaken on social capital and resettlement of internally displaced persons in Kenya, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data was deemed necessary to not only describe and generate results that could be generalized,
but also to provide deeper and detailed analysis of social capital in respect to the
resettlement of IDPs.

3.8 Methods of Data Collection

A number of methods were used to collect data. Hence the study embraced
methodological triangulation in order to improve the overall outcome. These included
interviews with respondents, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group
discussions. Interviews with the respondents were conducted by administering the
questionnaire directly to the respondents.

Researcher-administered questionnaires were useful for this study on two accounts. One,
it completely addressed the problem of non-response rate, and two; it provided a chance
for the researcher to explain the study objectives to the respondents. The personal
interaction between the researcher and the respondents in the process of administering the
questionnaires provided a humanistic character in the whole exercise. This created a
friendly social environment that encouraged the selected respondents to participate and
complete the questionnaires.

The study benefited a lot from observation method since it provided a detailed depiction
of living conditions of the respondents. It also greatly helped in depicting the extent to
which local social connections influenced economic outcomes within the household. In
most cases the observation was structured. This entailed the use of an observation matrix
(see appendix V) in order to avoid collecting data on everything including that which was
not necessary for the study. Hence, the observation matrix served as a tool for specifying
the aspects to be observed. In particular, the observation method focused on those
observable aspects that were considered as important indicators of the level of IDPs resettlement. Besides providing the specific aspects to be observed during field work, the observation matrix made the processes more effective and less time consuming.

The observation matrix covered parameters on the nature of housing. Specifically, it helped in collecting data on whether the IDPs houses were permanent, semi-permanent or temporary structures. This was achieved by observing and recording the type of construction material used for the majority of the exterior walls of the houses and the construction material of the roofs of most of the houses. Those that lived in permanent houses that belonged to them were believed to be better resettled than those that lived in temporary structures and the rented shelters.

Thus through observation, it was possible to provide categories on different levels of resettlement. Other important aspects that were captured by the observation matrix were the water and sanitation in terms of the observed sources of water and modes of disposing human faecal matter. Source of water for drinking and household use and type of sanitation were deemed to be important predictors of the overall well-being of the family.

Finally, the observation matrix was used to guide in observing the various land use activities in the study areas. This was considered important because most of the livelihood activities are influenced by the type of land use activities taking place in a given geographical area.

Interviews with key informants on the other hand were done in order to obtain a broader understanding of associational life and its influence on the local socioeconomic dynamics. The key informants selected for this study were the chiefs who were otherwise
considered as village authorities with long-standing leading role and adequate knowledge on village affairs. In addition, they were considered to be credible and accessible sources of information.

Focus Group Discussions were also conducted with view to obtaining rich, detailed and balanced data to supplement the data gathered through the questionnaires. In each county two focus group discussions were conducted each comprising of ten participants. Participants for focus group discussions were mobilized through group leaders. The membership included both male and female participants with the view to ensuring a balanced gender perspective on the issues under investigation. The participants were selected on the basis of having lived in the study area for at least two years and one had to be a member of a social group for at least six months. These conditions had to be fulfilled because the intention was to obtain information from participants who are directly involved in group activities. Each focus group discussion lasted for about one hour and twenty minutes. All the proceedings were taped after obtaining consent from the participants. This helped in saving time and also guaranteeing that no information was lost during the discussions.

3.9 Tools of Data Collection

Structured questionnaires were used to gather data from the selected households. The questionnaires included both open-ended and closed-ended questions in order to obtain detailed information about the respondents’ experiences. The household questionnaire was divided into six sections: section A to section E. Section A sought information relating to the respondent’s characteristics which were used as proxies for determinants of social capital. Section B of the questionnaire sought information on groups and social
networks in terms of membership and scope of interaction within and outside the community.

The frequencies of interaction as well as the different levels of interaction were used to capture information on the types of social capital. The third and fourth section sought information on the impact of social capital on the household welfare and on the sustainability of social capital respectively. The last section sought information on the levels of settlement. On the other hand, key informant guide was used to gain clarity of specific issues around the key variables. Focus group discussion guide was used to direct group discussions.

3.10 Field work

Field work for this study was conducted for a period of three months between February 2016 and May 2016. Prior to the actual field work, important logistical concerns had to be addressed. These included the recruitment of research assistants and piloting of the research instruments. The researcher recruited four university students undertaking bachelor’s studies in social sciences. The selected research assistants had to satisfy three basic conditions. First, they must have been in their third year of study, and secondly, other than demonstrating interest in social research, they must have had successfully attended and passed a course on research methods. Thirdly, they needed to be residents of Nakuru County and Uasin Gishu County. The rationale for the latter condition was to have somebody who was well familiar with the study area in order to ensure that data were collected in the sampled village units only. Hence, two research assistants were from Nakuru County and the other two from Uasin Gishu County. The four research assistants were meticulously trained on data collection methods and etiquette before they
were released to go to the field. They were also taken through each specific question in the questionnaire.

Pilot study was also a critical aspect of field work. This was done in order to test the validity, reliability and feasibility of the research instruments. The outcome of the pilot study helped in refining and re-focusing the instruments of data collection in a way that the quality and credibility of the data collected was enhanced. In addition, it helped in approximating the amount of time that was needed to complete administering a single questionnaire.

The research assistants helped in administering questionnaires and filling the observation checklist. They were not required to conduct focus group discussion and key informant interviews because the two were considered to be more technical and thus needed somebody with skills to conduct such interviews. Hence the main researcher conducted FDGs and key informant interviews.

3.11 Data Analysis

The data collected was first checked for completeness and consistency before processing. Checking was done with the view to detecting any errors and omissions and other possible discrepancies so as to guarantee quality data that would give reliable and valid results. After checking and cleaning the data, quantitative data were then keyed into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and present quantitative data. Qualitative data on the other hand was analyzed by use of content analysis and direct verbatim reporting. Cross-tabulations were also done to test the relationship between independent variables and the dependent
variable. For qualitative data, transcribing was done and thereafter thematic and content analysis was performed. The objective was to identify the main themes that emerged from the responses given by the respondents. However, in some cases respondents’ views were reported in direct verbatim.

### 3.12 Challenges related to the Study

Most of the respondents interviewed were still anticipating compensation from the government. Any person visiting them to inquire on any issue is assumed to be a government agent collecting information to be used for informing procedures for compensating the victims of internal displacement. Thus the mere inclusion into the study elicited in some respondents’ expectations of obtaining special benefits. However, when it was made clear there were no immediate benefits for them, some opted not to participate in the study. This became a challenge as new respondents were to be found to replace those that dropped out. As a result more time than planned was spent in replacing respondents.

This study was done at a time when the case against the Deputy President of Kenya and a Kenyan journalist were active in the International Criminal Court (ICC). This caused a lot of suspicion from the respondents that the researcher could have been an officer of ICC. This made some of them reluctant to provide information needed. However, a lot of explanation was done to convince them that the study was a genuine academic exercise. Crucial identification documents of the researcher such as the national identity card, student identity card including introductory letter from the university were made available to the respondents to clear any doubt about the study.
Despite having identified victims of internal displacement during the familiarization visit, some government administrators in the same areas where the victims were identified refused to cooperate and categorically maintained that there was no violence and that internal displacement never took place in their areas of jurisdiction. It was presumed that they feared that legal action would be taken against them for failing to prevent violence within their jurisdiction. This posed a great challenge both in terms of time and logistics of identifying another location.

3.13 Ethical Considerations

This study fully complied with the basic ethical standards of a research endeavor. During interviews with the participants, complete disclosure about the researcher with regard to his background and the purpose of the study was provided. The participants were also informed of their basic rights to decline to answer any particular question and also to withdraw from the study at any time. The respondents were assured that nowhere were they required to write their names and in case it became absolutely necessary, pseudonyms would be used instead. The researcher assured participants that any information they provided would not be disclosed to any other party but shall only be used for analytical purposes. Before data collection exercise, tools for data collection were thoroughly reviewed by my supervisors to guarantee that they had minimal or no potential for harming the research participants.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of two main parts. The first part contains descriptive analysis while the second part contains correlation analysis. Part one is divided into several sections of analysis arranged according to the study objectives. Section 4.2 contains data and descriptive analysis of the background characteristics of the respondents. Section 4.3 examines the extent to which households belong to community groups, purpose for joining groups and characterization of group’s composition; section 4.4 presents information on the types of social capital present in the study area; section 4.5 contains information on the influence of social capital on families’ welfare; 4.6 presents findings on levels of resettlement; 4.7 contains information on factors influencing sustainability of social capital and section 4.8 presents results of correlation analysis.

4.2 Demographic Profiles of the Respondents

This section presents the key characteristics of the households sampled. Table 4.1 summarizes the distribution of household characteristics by sex, age, literacy level, income and marital status. The results in Table 4.1 show that 52.0 per cent of household heads were male while 48.0 per cent were female. The variance in gender distribution is due in part to the patriarchal system (characteristic of many African communities) which does not allow women to head households when adult males are available. Secondly, due to the male dominance, it is highly unlikely that women will comment or make decisions on household matters when adult males are present. Thirdly, men are always expected to
provide protection and shelter for the family; a responsibility that gives men authority over women and the entire household.

Table 4.3: Household Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-39</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary school(college)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (Ksh)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10000</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-20000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-30000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-400000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data

The age group of the majority of household heads was between 29 years to 39 years comprising 43.2 per cent of the total respondents. This indicates that the population in the communities where the study was done is relatively young and falls within the
The majority in the sample (73.3) were also married. From the data presented it is evident that majority of the respondents were married and were within the economically active age. Literacy levels were significantly high among the respondents with 66.8 percent of the respondents having attained secondary school education.

The generally significantly high literacy levels among the IDPs can be attributed to the Free Primary Education (FPE) Policy introduced in 2003 by the government. This may have largely contributed to high completion rates at the primary level and the subsequent large transitions to secondary schools. The corresponding figures for college and university literacy levels were 17.8 per cent and 9.3 per cent respectively. The high literacy levels for tertiary education may be attributed to the expansion of tertiary education in Kenya. Both counties have at least a public university and several satellite campuses for private and public universities have been established to meet the increasing demand for university education. Only one 6.3 per cent of the respondent had the basic primary education. The high levels of education among the respondents points to the presence of significant amount of human capital within the studied population. This further suggests that with proper institutional arrangement the available human capital can be tapped to bring about positive social change both at the individual level and the community.

Most of the respondents 77.0 per cent were not employed. Only 23.0 per cent were employed. During the time of displacement, the victims’ first priority is their safety. Thus the majority take flight leaving behind their property and essential documents including their academic credentials which are used to seek employment. This suggests that the
majority of the respondents seek employment and earn their living in the informal sector which does not necessarily require proof of skilled training and further education. As a result, average monthly incomes were low for most households.

Average monthly earnings ranged from Ksh 0-10,000 (59.8%) to Ksh. 40,000 (7.2%). However, 59.8 per cent of the respondents earned not more than Ksh. 10,000 per month. This is consistent with the International Labour Organization’s (2004) view that employees in the informal sector hardly attract substantial incomes to cater for the needs of their families. The meager earnings by the majority of the respondents mean that meeting their everyday financial obligations comes with a lot of strain. For example, the family economic situation may determine whether or not children will be sent to school.

These findings correspond with Wairire and Kiboro’s (2014) view that despite the existence of a robust network of poverty reduction strategies, progress towards poverty reduction in Kenya remains dismal especially when measured against international development targets. Some of the strategies put in place include the devolved funds that are aimed at reaching out to the underprivileged populations at the grassroots level. Some good examples of such funds include the Constituency Development Fund (CDF), Youth Enterprise Development Fund (YEDF), and Women’s Enterprise Fund. However, it is paradoxical that high levels of income poverty among IDPs were witnessed in an environment with elaborate poverty reduction strategies. The fact that the majority of the sample was married and also not employed implies that there is a high dependency ratio a factor that also negatively influences the well-being of household members. Economic inability can compel IDPs to engage in illegitimate ways of earning a livelihood; a situation that is likely to lead to an increase in crime rates in their neighborhoods.
The fact that the majority of the IDPs are not employed, calls for alternative courses of action in order to enable them provide for their families. For this reason, it is becoming increasingly common among the internally displaced persons to pool resources together and form self-help group for income generating activities. The key assumption behind the formation of self-help groups is that they have tangible payoffs to individual members and they contribute either directly or indirectly to higher levels of well-being even at the household level.

4.3 Groups and Social Networks

Community groups and social networks are commonly used by Kenyans as a strategy of accessing community resources, working and learning together in order to improve livelihoods. According to Putnam; Feldstein and Cohen (2003), groups are said to provide avenues for civic engagement and for recreational and socio-political activities. Thus the mere participation in such groups can have an economic impact by providing opportunities for members to share information, enforce informal transactions and coordinate on cooperative outcomes (La Ferrara, 2002). Moreover, community groups can improve access to resources and services such as improved seeds and livestock breeds, farm technology, and household items; provide collective labour, create opportunities for income diversification, provide moral and spiritual support, and empowerment; and access to sources of power and decision making (Place et al. 2004; Roberston, 1996). In this sense, groups and social networks can be a source of bonding and bridging social capital contingent on the level of interaction.

On examining the extent to which households belonged to community groups, the criteria followed to become a member, the main purpose for joining a group, characteristics of
group membership as well as the degree of interaction of these groups with other associations both within and outside the neighborhood where the group(s) is found, the study revealed that a big number of families were affiliated to social groups. The data in Table 4.2 show that nearly 74.0 per cent of all the households sampled had membership into social groups. Using affiliation to a group as an indicator of social capital, it is apparent from the data that there are substantial amount of social capital among the interviewed respondents.

Social capital is believed to have the potential of reducing the possibility of becoming poor and the benefits that households generate from social capital are more particularly for the underprivileged households (Grootaert et al. 2002). The high level of affiliation to social groups by households can be associated with the expected benefits that are likely to accrue from self-help groups. Too often, investment in self-help groups is perceived by many people to have the potential of generating immediate and desirable outcomes that have a positive influence on the household well-being. Moreover, the widespread poverty, evidenced by the low income levels by majority of the households interviewed, implies households could have been forced by insufficiency of material wants to embrace tactics beyond individual struggles and adopt organized mobilization and coordination of actions at the grassroots level. Indeed, this was confirmed by a group leader from Nakuru County who revealed that:

*We came together not by chance but out of necessity. We realized (community members) that we could not address our basic needs as single individuals, and even if we could, it would be with so many struggles.*

*Therefore, we formed into groups where we help each other in turns.*

In terms of the criteria used to join social groups, majority of the households (55.8 per cent) said that they voluntarily joined the groups while 16.2 per cent and nearly 2.0 per
cent said they were invited into the groups and required to join groups respectively. The failure to voluntarily join the group and await invitation or prompting by others may obtain from the diverse socio cultural and economic situation of the population residing in the study area. A participant in focus group discussion pointed out that:

*I delayed to join a social group until I was invited because of my economic situation. I did not have money to pay membership dues. However, when I knew that I could make my contribution in the form of work in order to remain a member, I gladly accepted the invitation.*

This corroborates what was expressed by a key informant in Uasin Gishu County:

*We (local administration) realized that we have people here (in the village) who are extremely poor and could not afford to pay membership registration fee. Yet, these groups are instrumental in improving their economic well-being. In order for them to also join and remain as active members, we approached the group leaders and advised them to invite them and device alternative ways of becoming a member even if it meant making contributions in form of work. They accepted our suggestion and those who could not pay in form of money got the opportunity to become members.*
Table 4.4: Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria for Joining a group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to join</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary choice</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

Both Nakuru county and Uasin-Gishu county are multi-ethnic counties with each ethnic community having different variables from each other including but not limited to language, culture, traditions, beliefs and orientations. These variables are likely to have a significant influence on social interaction including the decision to either join or not join a social group. This observation compares closely to Wairire’s (2014:93) where he points out that “Kenya’s sociocultural and economic situation comprises of different variables including but not limited to language, culture, traditions, beliefs, orientations to different aspects of life, and means of livelihood”. On this basis a comparison of group membership in the two counties was done to determine whether there was a significant difference. Indeed, there was an observed difference though marginal between the two counties in respect to group membership. The data in Table 4.3 shows that 75.0 per cent of the sample from Nakuru County belonged to social groups as compared to 73.0 per cent in Uasin Gishu County.
Table 4.5: Group Membership in the Individual Sampled Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uasin Gishu</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

The difference, even though marginal, is perhaps as a result of the differences in the number of social groups in each county. According to the Republic of Kenya (2013), Nakuru County had approximately 6,268 registered self-help groups of which 3,500 were active women groups and 2,768 were youth groups while Uasin Gishu had an estimated 877 registered self-help groups (Uasin Gishu Integrated Development Plan 2013-2018). The marginal variations between the two counties in respect to group membership may further imply differences in the amount of social capital in each of the counties and subsequently different levels of resettlement.

4.3.1 Reasons for Joining Community Associations

Individuals have varying reasons and motivations for choosing to become a member of a group. However, the basic reasoning is that groups and community networks developed through relationships possess quantifiable returns that can either explicitly or implicitly lead to an improvement in the levels of well-being. This was examined by enquiring from the respondents their main drive for becoming a member of a social group.

The desire to improve the current family livelihood and the need to access services was reported by 37.0 per cent of the respondents interviewed as the key motivation for joining groups. As a matter of fact, this is a persuasive motivation for joining groups especially
for the victims of internal displacement. Ordinarily, violent evictions result in huge damages including loss of livelihood. A sizeable number might have had their vital particulars such as academic credentials ruined or misplaced when they were escaping from violent attacks. Therefore, it becomes increasingly hard for them to access basic services. Hence, for them, the only latitude available in order to access essential services is by belonging to a group.

These reasons correspond to Wairire and Muiruri (2017) analysis of vyama in Kenya. They define vyama, which is a Kiswahili word for group association as “small, informal groups that draw on the collective resources and capacities of their members to address individual needs p.292”. They found out that people join vyama (group associations) for various reasons which include; to tap into the collective resources and capacities of their members to address individual needs and deal with issues which would be difficult to address individually, to defray financial strain for members through diversification of income-generating activities, to increase bargaining power as they expand their networks of support through new contacts and to take advantage of the safe environment especially for women to share their innermost thoughts and desires without fear of ridicule and disdain.

The instrumental value of belonging to social groups particularly to the households of victims of internal displacement was expressed during focus group discussion by a participant as follows:

*Had I not joined a group, I would be a very miserable person today. Membership into a group is the only effective insurance for poor people like us. Prior to my displacement, I cared little about social groups. Today, almost everything I possess it’s from the group in which I am a member.*
For us (for victims of internal displacement) groups were the primary source of material support for our households (A victim of internal displacement from Nakuru County).

In a similar manner, another victim of internal displacement from Uasin-Gishu County stated that:

*Coping with life after displacement was not easy. My family had nothing to survive on. We were simply staring at death until I became a member of a self-help group where I received a lot of support with material things and credit.*

These observations are consistent with La Ferara’s (2002) argument that “people who do not have access to formal labour market and whose options in the informal market are relatively unattractive can often benefit from pooling resources and working in groups, p.62”.

Another considerable number of respondents nearly 23.0 per cent joined groups primarily to benefit the community. This is purely a utilitarian thinking where some people engage in actions that will benefit and bring happiness to the greatest number. For example, by recognizing the plight of IDPs, some people would want to strengthen collective efficacy in the community by forming groups in order to tap talents, skills, knowledge and resources that are necessary for accomplishing community wide activities. This is based on the understanding that certain tasks or felt needs require more than an individual to accomplish. In such situations individuals may develop the desire to become members of groups to work with others for the benefit of everybody in the community.
Almost 9.0 per cent of the respondents were compelled by the desire to achieve spiritual, social status and self-esteem needs. Conflicts do not only lead to destruction of property, they also have serious psycho-social effects on the victims. Spitzer and Twikirize (2014) observe that in times of conflicts, people suffer from long-term psycho-social effects related to shocking experiences such as witnessing horrific actions such as brutal murders, destruction of livelihoods and personal embarrassment and cruelty. Hence it is acceptable that people who have had horrifying experiences may be forced by such situations to join groups because they (groups) offer some therapeutic benefits. A female participant in a group discussion from Nakuru County expressed the healing effect she received from the group as follows:

*Even though I did not immediately receive material support from the group, I benefitted in a great way from psycho-social support I received from other members of the group. The constant encouragement and interaction with others in the group restored my hope and made me feel that I was not alone in this world. In the process of confiding my problems to some of my friends in the group, I discovered that others were even more psychologically disturbed than me by the horrors of post-election violence. This made me stop having self-pity and I began to view life in a positive perspective.*

This observation further corresponds with Nzuve’s (1999) assertion that groups provide individuals with a sense of self-esteem. Besides conferring status to the members, groups boost self-confidence which is further improved when individuals gain recognition and appreciation in groups with high premium in society. At least 5.3 per cent of the sample indicated that they joined groups in order to insulate themselves from unforeseen and adversarial situations. Only one respondent identified leisure as the main reason for joining a group. This, however, was too small to infer any sensible conclusion.
It is manifest from the results obtained that other than the tangible benefits derived from group membership, most of the victims of internal displacement seriously value the prospects of resorting to their group for support in times of need. It is also evident that self-help groups were instrumental in uplifting the socioeconomic situation of the internally displaced persons. For instance, the victims were provided with building materials and other household belongings. This is confirmed by the following expression from a key informant.

*In this area, resettlement of internally displaced persons can largely be attributed to the contribution of social groups. Through groups, many households that had no shelter were assisted by their groups to construct houses and obtain basic household items. In addition, groups have really helped us (chiefs) in coordinating distribution of materials meant for IDPs from different organizations. (Chief from Nakuru County).*

**Table 4.6: Reasons for Joining Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve my household's current livelihood or access to services</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As insurance in times of emergency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To benefit the community</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For enjoyment/Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For spiritual, social status and self-esteem</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data

The results in Table 4.4 demonstrate that being a member of a community group accords the member the opportunity to obtain resources that would influence positively the various aspects of household’s well-being. For example, one can access material benefits and services such as clothing, foodstuff, housing, schooling and health care among others. It is also clear that in strenuous and stressful circumstances, groups provided the
much needed social support thus mitigating the effects of stressing situations by providing members with a safe forum for venting out frustrations. Hence groups and social networks served as a form of social therapy to the members. The psycho-social support received from groups may instill the members with a sense of self-worth and control.

4.3.2 Characterization of Group Membership

Few people would want to be alone. However, many people get assurances by associating with others and being part of a group. Groups have the ability to bolster people’s sense of self-worth and feelings of self-esteem. Groups can either be homogeneous or heterogeneous in appearance depending on the characteristics of individual members. Characteristics of group members are important because they determine the degree of group cohesiveness. Moreover, it determines the degree to which members are attracted to one another and share the group’s goals (Nzuve, 1999). It is against this background that the characteristics of group membership were examined based on various variables ranging from religion to marital status as indicated in Table 4.5.

Overall, there is greater heterogeneity in group membership. One possible explanation for this heterogeneity is the fact that the households interviewed had been displaced because of either their ethnic or political orientation differed from the dominant ethnic group in the study area. Therefore, in order to downplay these differences, they choose to join groups that have diverse membership probably with the view to promoting social integration among different ethnic groups.
Heterogeneity or greater diversity can have instrumental value to the members. For example, Knowles (2005) points out that the more heterogeneous group membership, the greater the degree of generalized trust the group is likely to build. This type of trust is critical in encouraging cooperation among community members especially with regard to collective action. Heterogeneous associations have wider reservoir of knowledge and resources hence the potential benefit to members is higher. This is consistent with findings of Grootaert et al. (2002) in Burkina Faso where heterogeneity along dimensions such as education and economic status was found to confer the greatest benefits to the members.

### Table 4.7: Group Membership Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood/village</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/kin group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data

Of all the respondents, 60.0 per cent said that most of the people in the groups are of the same religion while nearly 55.0 per cent said most people in the groups are of the same gender. These results are consistent with the prevailing social structures in the study area.
The study area is predominantly occupied by Christians. Hence the expectation that homogeneity in religion would be observed across many groups.

The social division of labour and adherence to social norms along gender considerations can also account for the similarities in gender with regard to group membership. The daily calendar for women and men varies significantly such that time allotted for group activities also varies greatly between the two genders. In addition, women’s reality and experiences are different from men’s. Women and men have different needs, preferences and interests. These may be responsible for the observed differences in group membership with regard to gender.

In developing countries, sub-Saharan Africa in particular, women experience significant gender-related restrictions and vulnerabilities relative to men because of the prevailing structures in the family and society that put them at a subordinate position (Whitehead and Kabeer, 2001). Women encounter patriarchal barriers in decision-making. Thus the gender-based inequalities make women’s participation and voice limited especially in groups comprising of mixed gender. This undermines the efficacy of groups comprising both genders. In addition, the power differentials in decision making between men and women whereby men tend to control decision-making processes compels women to join groups whose membership is exclusively female where they can negotiate and share their experiences with other women on a level playing field.

On whether or not members were of the same ethnicity, there was a small margin of differences in opinion from the respondents; nearly 39.0 per cent said that group members were not of the same ethnic group whereas 35.0 per cent indicated that most of
the group members were of the same ethnic affiliation. In some instances, it is possible that group membership would comprise of people from the same ethnic group if they are the dominant community in a given settlement.

In other circumstances, especially in settlements with mixed ethnicities, membership into groups may not necessarily be along ethnic affiliation. For example, in Uasin Gishu County, the villages at the border with Kakamega County are predominantly inhabited by the Luhya ethnic community. Hence, group membership would similarly be dominated by members from the Luhya community. On the other hand, Langas which is a suburb of Eldoret town is inhabited by people from different ethnic groups. Thus group membership in Langas would be expected to comprise of members from the various ethnic groups in that area.

A critical observation from the data is that most of the group members were from the same village/community. Although a significant proportion of the respondents (34.3 per cent) were of the opinion that not all group members were from the same village/community. The fact that majority of the group members were from the same village implies two things. First, members joined groups near them in order to avoid incurring expenses in terms of time and money travelling to another village. Second, there is intense interaction and networking among people of the same village which in turn implies that the amount of bonding social capital within the village is huge. On the other hand, having members from other communities/villages suggests that there are effective interactions and connections beyond one village to the next. This is indicative of the presence of large stocks of bridging social capital in the study area.
An important observation from the data presented in Table 4.5 is that most of the group members are neither of the same occupation, political party, and marital status nor are they of the same income levels. Whereas occupation, marital status and income are considered important parameters of status, yet, in this case are downplayed, means that the social groups and networks that victims of internal displacement affiliate with are not for providing recognition and status to their members but are for accomplishing a particular task.

4.4 Types of Social Capital

To measure the types of social capital prevalent among the households studied, the study assessed the ties that people share with each other. These ties are generally seen as positive for a person’s development. Social ties are characterized in different ways. This study adopted Lin’s (2001), Putnam’s (2000) and Woolcock’s (2001; 2002) characterization of social capital. Following their conceptualization, three types of associational life are examined. These are the local connections or networks within the village, networks outside the village and relationships with people in authority and institutions (vertical connections). This is the distinction between “bonding” social capital, “bridging” social capital and “linking” social capital.

Bonding ties bind socially similar individuals to each other and are regarded as important for “getting by”. Bridging ties, on the other hand, enable individuals to relate horizontally with individuals outside their immediate social environment. Bridging social capital provide people with possibilities for gaining access to more diversified resources outside the immediate social surroundings. In addition, it creates bridges across different social networks thus enabling the people to “get a head”. Linking ties enable an individual to
connect to another individual along vertical scale of social and economic positions in society.

So conceptualized, it becomes possible to map a community's associational life. In this study, the extent of interaction between groups was used to measure if the groups have ties only among themselves in the neighborhood or they associate with other groups from outside their community including with people in positions of authority. This was necessary to determine the extent of associational life and consequently highlight the main types of social capital in the study area.

Assessment of the prevalence of the various forms of social capital (bonding, bridging and linking) is important because different combinations of these forms of social capital are responsible for a broad range of development outcomes and welfare benefits. Such assessment has particular significance especially in understanding the plight of internally displaced persons, who typically depend on groups and social networks especially in areas where formal institutions are fatally weak or absent. The local connections (Bonding social capital) were assessed according to the extent to which the respondents (members of groups) indicated they interacted with groups that had similar goals as theirs and with those that had different goals but all found within the same community.

External linkages/networks (Bridging social capital) were assessed by asking the respondents whether they had relationships with other groups outside the village with either similar or different goals. These types of relationships are important because they help in finding employment, market opportunities, obtaining technical information or even receiving material support during emergencies. According to Lin (2001) and
Woolcock (2001; 2002), such connections have the potential of bridging the local villages with settings that are richer in resources and which are more likely to provide access to greater amount of resources of better quality.

The third set of connection is the associational activity between the local villages with people in position of authority. This type of relationship is vertical and represents the “Linking” type of social capital. This was assessed by asking the respondents whether their group interacted with people in positions of authority. In addition, the extent of interaction with institutions that are non-governmental but outside the community was also assessed. Table 4.6 presents the findings.

Though most of the respondents reported the frequency of social interaction between groups to have been occasional in all the categories save for the interaction with non-governmental institutions outside the community, a varying degree of social interaction between groups inside and outside the village was observed. With regard to social interaction among groups, a key informant pointed out the following:

*To make our groups strong, we encourage interaction with other groups within and outside our community regardless whether the groups’ goals are similar or not. Group leaders in particular visit other groups to learn how they do their activities and forge friendly relationships. I have visited at least four groups outside our community and more than five group leaders have also visited our group. (Group leader from Uasin-Gishu County).*

The degree of social interaction between groups with similar goals in the neighborhood is high (70.3%) compared with those with similar goals but outside the community (67.5%).
This finding is corroborated by remarks from a key informant who pointed out the following:

In this location, there is intense group interaction especially between those with similar goals within the community. I suppose this (interaction) is as a result of close proximity to one another that accords them the opportunity to learn how others carry out their activities. At times during Barazas (village gatherings) different groups share their experiences and advise other groups on how they can become effective in their activities. I am happy about this kind of interaction because unity and cohesion is enhanced in my village (Chief from Nakuru County).

Noticeable, is that the scope of association with other groups with dissimilar objectives but within the same community is marginally higher (68.0%) than with those groups with similar goals but outside the neighborhood. This indicates that there are large stocks of bridging social capital in the community. Thus, there could be a lot of networking with possibilities of generating resources from such type of interaction.

Ideally, it is expected that if groups have similar goals whether within or outside the community, chances are that they also have similar resources and possibly similar sources. This definitely narrows their opportunities to expand their resource base either because of competition or availability of such resources being limited. This view corresponds with Burt’s (1992) observation that dense networks are inefficient because they supply huge amount of unnecessary information.

Since human beings are rational actors, the members of groups would certainly build networks with those groups that they believe offer prospects of benefiting either through accessing material support, technical information and other resources that would improve
their well-being. This conforms to Granovetter’s (1973) characterization of social networks in terms of weak ties and strong ties.

According to Granovetter (1973), weak social ties are those that are developed through interactions with peers across more distant and separate clusters and by extension with separate goals. They represent the bridging form of social capital. In contrast, the strong ties are the deep and close-knit relationships that are mostly personal networks that are connected to a given person(s) contact and ego (Boissevain, 1968).

Interaction with groups which had different goals and outside the village/neighborhood was relatively lower than others (55.8%). This could be attributed to the costs involved in maintaining distant relationships in terms of travelling costs and time. These can be a deterrent in investing in distant relationships particularly among poor groups without adequate resources at their disposal. Therefore, it is normal to observe limited interaction between groups with different goals and particularly when such groups are not found within the same community.

The extent of interaction between groups with different goals inside and outside the village was confirmed by a key informant as follows:

_There is intense interaction between groups in this village even if they don’t have similar goals. The interaction is not limited to those groups that are within this location. Occasionally, I find groups from outside this location coming to visit our groups here (within the location) and the vice-versa. Religious groups are particularly fond of these kinds of visits. Other than religious groups, women groups are also visited or visit their counterparts from other locations. The purpose for these patterns of_
interaction is basically to learn from one another and share information about existing opportunities. (Chief from Uasin Gishu County).

Interaction with people in positions of authority was reported by 50.8 per cent of the respondents. This represents the linking form of social capital. A number of issues can be inferred from the above results with regard to the amount of various forms of social capital available in the study areas. Comparing the frequency of interaction between and across social networks, it becomes possible to empirically determine the particular types that are most and least prevalent in the study area.

Of the three types, bonding social capital is the most prevalent with (70.3%) expressing it. Perhaps, the plausible explanation for bonding social capital being the most prevalent is because it represents the immediate ties that households in their struggle to resettle call upon for support. Another possible explanation for this observation is abundance of sense of community among the households. Further, it implies that there are very high levels of trust between members and the practice of reciprocity and relying on each other is also high. Trust among community members is a vital aspect in the building of bonding type of social capital.

Bridging social capital was the second most prevalent with 68.0 per cent expressing it. After establishing and utilizing internal networks, community members are obliged to develop cross-community links and networks in order to expand their scope of opportunities. Moreover, diverse associations tend to yield higher levels of benefits than others. This is agreement with Grootaert’s (2001), argument that diverse groups have different asset bases and affiliations that can open up opportunities for sharing information and knowledge.
## Table 4.8: Scope of Social Interaction/Ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes occasionally</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes frequently</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with groups with common goals in the same community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with groups outside the community but with common goals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with groups in the same community but with different goals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with groups outside the same community but with different goals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with people in positions of authority</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with institutions that are non-governmental but outside the community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data

Linking social capital was the least prevalent type of social capital having been expressed by 50.8 per cent of the total respondents. Ideally, people tend to first forge primary social relationships and networks with their peers as opposed to with other people with whom they are different in terms of statuses. Linking social capital is a demonstration of power differentiation between people in positions of authority and those that are not in authority. Access to people in authority is highly bureaucratized; a character that can deter people from engaging with people in positions of authority because of delays that come with bureaucracies.
According to Krishna (2002), grassroots leaders and intermediaries enable the linkages between underprivileged communities and outside development assistance including government programs. Although Krishna (2002) did not highlight the potential shortcomings of such intermediaries, they could take advantage of the poor peoples’ vulnerability and use their (leaders and intermediaries) advantageous positions to charge usurious fees in order to facilitate connections with service providers. These reasons can possibly explain why linking social capital was found to be the least prevalent in the community studied.

4.4.1 Trust and Solidarity

Trust and solidarity are some of the aspects around which measurement of social capital is organized. Trust is a good measure of social capital which is used to reflect the positive outcomes of social capital stemming from networks and cooperation. Levels of trust among different actors including neighbors, people from other ethnic or linguistic groups, strangers and key service providers are important indicators of the amount of social capital in a given community.

Trust is a mental concept that is not easy to measure because it’s subject to various interpretations by different people. However, effort was made to analyze the extent to which people trusted each other in different types of social behaviour. The analysis was done at two levels: generalized trust and particularized trust. The former entails the degree to which a person trusts people generally while the latter refers to the level of trust in particular types of people. Trust is also measured in terms of perceptions in the context of specific transactions such as lending and borrowing money.
Generalized trust refers to trust not tied to specific known individuals. It is built over time and is a function of village cohesion and norms (Grootaert *et al.*, 2002). A measure of generalized trust includes questions on whether people perceive others as willing to contribute to village collective activities and whether they think they could get support in case of emergency from other people in the village other than family members and close friends. It is evident that there was high level of generalized trust in the sample. On the whole, nearly 74.0 per cent of the respondents agreed strongly that most people living in the village can be trusted and nearly 14.0 per cent somewhat agreed that their neighbors can be trusted. Only 4.3 per cent and 3.5 per cent somewhat disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively while 5.3 per cent were indifferent. Table 4.7 presents data on trust and solidarity category of social capital.

High level of generalized trust was also consistently reported in other categories of trust except in matters of lending and borrowing money. A significant proportion of respondents 59.3 per cent and 24.5 per cent disagreed somewhat and disagreed strongly respectively with the view that in their village/neighborhood, one has to be alert else someone is likely to take advantage of them. Only a small proportion of the respondents were of the contrary opinion with 11.0 per cent agreeing strongly and 4.0 per cent agreeing somewhat. The remaining 1.3 per cent of the total respondents was indifferent.

The data also indicates that there is a higher probability that most people in the sampled villages would be willing to provide help in case of need. About 27.0 per cent of the sampled respondents strongly agreed that most people in their village would be willing to give help when called upon to do so while 66.3 per cent somewhat agreed that in case of need, help would be obtained from the neighbors. Only a small minority 3.0 per cent and
3.8 per cent somewhat disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that most people would be willing to provide help whenever a need arose. However, these were too small to make any significant comparison. The high prevalence of generalized trust in the sample area is an indication that the existing groups and social networks are effective in generating norms of reciprocity and trust among the neighbors.

Concerning matters of lending and borrowing money, 47.0 per cent somewhat felt that people did not trust each while 9.0 per cent were absolutely sure that people generally did not trust one another in lending and borrowing money. A fairly large proportion 40.3 per cent and another small proportion of 2.5 per cent reluctantly disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the idea that most people in their village cannot be trusted in matters of lending and borrowing money.

Table 4.9: Generalized Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>N=400</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who live in this village can be trusted</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village, one has to be alert; else someone is likely to take</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantage of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in this village would give you help if you needed it</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village, people generally do not trust each other in matters of</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lending and borrowing money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relatively low level of trust on matters of lending and borrowing money is an important highlight which could be attributed to the transient settlement of victims of displacement. Though individuals may have returned and resettled, their period of stay cannot be certainly determined since some of them opt to sell their land and relocate elsewhere due to fear of recurrent attacks. The lack of trust in matters of lending and borrowing money is validated by the remarks of one of the key informants:

*Most people in this community can be trusted on a range of issues. However, when it concerns money, people are not quick to lend or borrow money because they believe they may not recover it back. The reason for this is because some people relocate permanently to another place sometimes far and unknown to their neighbors who might have lent them some money. Some are neither kind to inform their neighbors when moving out nor willing to service their debts before moving out. This has really reduced the levels of trust in lending and borrowing money amongst neighbors.* (Chief, Uasin Gishu County).

This statement is indicative of the fact that defaulting to repay borrowed money is highly probable and that many people were not willing to take the risk of giving out their money without the prospect of a refund. Hence the decision not to lend out money is purely rational that is based on economic calculations (rational choice). Consequently, it is expected that the level of trust in lending and borrowing money would be low. However, there were exceptions. In some cases people only lend out money to people with whom they shared kinship ties. For example, a participant in a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) in Uasin Gishu County said:

*I hardly lend out money to people who are not my relatives because I can’t be so sure of when they will bring it back. I don’t trust them much with my money because in the event the migrated to another place it becomes*
extremely difficult to recover your money. I would rather lend them tools or give them food but not money. However, with relatives there is always a way of getting to know where they are and they return the favour through benevolent acts. For example my nephew did not have money to attend an interview. I had to lend him money in the hope that if he was successful he would help us in times of need.

It is apparent, however, that the kinds of connections relevant to lending money are primarily kinship in nature. Thus people were too careful to lend out their money outside the kinship set up. This corroborates the predominance and influence of bonding social capital in the study area.

Information on particularized trust shows significant variations in levels of trust across different actors. With regard to ethnicity, there is greater propensity for the sampled population to trust people from their own ethnic group as opposed to people from other ethnic groups. Nearly half of the respondents (49.5%) reported to have a very great trust of people from their own ethnic group and another 42.8 per cent trusting them to a greater extent. This is a substantial variation in the degree of trust in people from other ethnic groups. The proportion of respondents who trusted people from other ethnic groups was comparably lower with only 1.3 per cent trusting them to a very great extent and 4.0 per cent to a greater extent.

A plausible explanation for the varying levels of trust in people from one’s own ethnic and from other ethnic groups is the differences in patterns of interaction. Though the earlier finding showed that membership in groups is heterogeneous, this does not necessarily imply that the daily patterns of social interaction are guided by that heterogeneity; other factors are at play. There is greater social interaction among people
who are sociologically the same thus producing stronger bonds and networks which are responsible for the higher level of trust in people from the same ethnic group. This further corroborates the finding that bonding social capital is the most prevalent in the sample area. Generally, individuals are far more likely to trust people from their ethnic or linguistic group than people from other ethnic groups. This happens because the social distance between people of the same ethnic group is small. Thus trust tends to increase as social distance reduces and the converse is true.

Table 4.10: Particularized Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust variables</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N=400</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very small extent</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>Very great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in people with whom you share ethnic affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in people from other ethnic or linguistic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in police</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in non-government officials</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in government officers</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data.

Another key explanation for low the levels of trust toward people from other ethnic group is that individuals who might have experienced discrimination or felt disadvantaged are less likely to trust people from other ethnic groups either because of the discriminatory or disadvantageous treatment they may have received in the past. Much of the mistrust of people from other ethnic affiliations can also largely be attributed to the ethnic make-up of politics and the state. The political dynamics in Kenya remain largely influenced by
ethnic affiliations, arousing among community members feelings of suspicion of others who do not belong to their ethnic group.

Relatively more respondents 56.8 per cent trusted police to a greater extent. Trust in police was explained in one of the focus group discussions by a participant as follows:

*Police are good people. I trust them so much because were it not for them my family would have long been killed in the post-election violence. They rescued us from the attackers and even now we feel more secure because of their presence. They work well with other people from the government to help us. If something [bad] happened now, they would be the first people I would run to for help (A female participant in focus group discussion in Nakuru County).*

However, the levels of trust in strangers and non-governmental organization (NGO) workers were generally low compared with other actors with 67.3 per cent and 71.0 per cent trusting them to a small extent respectively. The level of trust for government officers was generally high with 39.8 per cent of the respondents trusting them to a greater extent.

The high level of trust in government officers can be attributed to the “*Operation Rudi Nyumbani*” resettlement program launched by the government through the Ministry of State for Special Programmes on 4th May 2008 (KHRC, 2008). This brought the government officers from the ministry into close contact with the displaced persons in the process of collecting information and providing compensation to the victims. Since a significant proportion of the victims of displacement benefitted from the program as assured by the government officers, they considered them as trustworthy individuals.
On the other hand, the low levels of trust in strangers and non-governmental organizations can be attributed to the cases that were going on at the International Criminal Court (ICC) against Kenyans accused for having been responsible. This made strangers and non-governmental organizations to be treated with suspicion. A participant from Nakuru County explained mistrust toward strangers and non-governmental organizations during focus group discussion as follows:

*The on-going cases at the ICC are making people really panic because we can’t predict the outcome. There are rumours spreading that any stranger visiting our community could be an officer of the court collecting evidence to be used by the court against the accused persons. Other people claim that the non-governmental organizations that are here are a group of investigators disguising themselves as NGOs. With such allegations, you can’t trust them because you can say something that can put you in trouble with the authorities.*

4.5 **Contribution of Social Capital to Household Well-being**

The pattern and scope of our social interactions (social capital) have a significant influence in our lives. However, they are particularly important to the unfortunate people who have less material possessions, meager income and without formal education (Woolcock, 2002). It is on this account that the question on whether or not social capital improved the welfare of victims of displacement is analyzed. It primarily identifies the benefits of being a member of a group and how such benefits influence households’ well-being.

The contribution of social capital on household welfare was measured by gauging the level to which families were able to obtain the numerous resources for welfare improvement from the groups and systems that respondents belonged to and those they
did not belong to. Hence, respondents were required to state if after they were displaced they obtained help not only from groups, networks or associations they belonged to but also from those they were not members.

The amount of help provided to households by their groups and associations and its impact towards improving their households’ well-being is summarized in Table 4.8. At least 92.5 per cent of the respondents acknowledged to have been supported by their groups and associations to obtain schooling services. Schooling is a strong indicator of well-being. Access to education expands an individual’s social understanding because of the mental and perceptual skills developed within and outside academic programs. It further broadens people’s potential both economically and socially by making them become tolerant of others who are dissimilar from them.

Table 4.11: Social Capital and Access to Essential Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of support received</th>
<th>N= 400</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to credit</td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to farming materials and technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to building materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuff</td>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data.

Putnam (2000), Uslaner (1998), Brehm and Rahm (1997) show that individual social trust (social capital) is strongly correlated with individual education level. Therefore, through
social capital, individuals are able to acquire education whose one of the essential functions is setting moral standards and equipping learners with a basic sense of morality. Consequently, it encourages individuals to participate in civic engagements and join various social organizations which are often conduits of resources necessary for improving household welfare. Schooling is also necessary for individuals to develop human capital necessary for improving productivity which eventually translates to better quality of life.

At least 91.2 per cent had obtained assistance on health care from the groups in which they were members. Most of the displaced families experience frequent health problems owing to greater exposure to infections due to either overcrowding or/and lack of proper hygiene. Therefore, receiving medical attention is a vital predictor of improved well-being. A family that falls sick too often and is not able to afford treatment, its over-all well-being has a likelihood of diminishing because poor health compromises households’ productive capacity. This is because besides the ailing member who could be incapacitated by disease, other family members may be compelled to sacrifice their time and stay home to take care of the sick member. Their withdrawal from income generating activities directly deprives the household of the necessary means for smoothing consumption at the household level.

From all the interviewed households, 86.0 per cent stated that they got assistance in enhancing access to water and sanitation services. Water and sanitation is an important welfare indicator. Availability of water provides a wide range of benefits that range from production of food, revenue accrued from water sales and other goods that depend on water, minimal fatigue, and better health outcomes. Lack of water and proper sanitation
facilities can lead to an increase in disease burden in the households which can even be fatal thus increasing mortality rates. Ordinarily, the benefits of better access to water and sanitation and improved well-being reinforce each other. Moreover, it brings down the degree of poverty within households.

Frequent exposure to income shocks is a common problem for victims of displacement. Ability to receive credit is one method of effectively protecting victims of violent displacement from the threat of income volatility. The study sought to assess the extent to which the victims of displacement obtained assistance from community associations in accessing credit. It emerged that 96.0 per cent had been assisted with credit. Normally, households living in conditions of deep poverty can hardly provide securities for obtaining credit from formal credit institutions. Therefore, they heavily rely on informal money lenders and group merry-go-rounds. Access to credit services enables impoverished families to secure capital for starting investments and promoting other capitals including human capital. Credit is thus an important determinant of well-being.

Most of the sampled households were involved in agriculture as their main source of livelihood. This implies that ability to afford agricultural inputs and technology is vital for the sustainability of their livelihood. The data gathered showed that a considerably high number of respondents, nearly 91.0 per cent acquired technological and agricultural services through social networks. Access to these services can substantially promote the well-being of households. This was confirmed by a male participant in a focus group discussion as follows:

We highly depend on our neighbors to get information on whether agricultural inputs like fertilizer have been delivered. Although the agricultural department communicates through the local administration
(chiefs), our neighbors are quick to share agricultural news about inputs and new agricultural technology. We also exchange equipment like knapsacks and other farming tools. This saves us money because you can borrow what you don’t have from your neighbor. (A male participant in focus group discussion, Nakuru County).

Generally, social networks and associations were found to be very useful in assisting IDPs obtain essential commodities for improving their quality of life. These include building materials (89.7.0%), food (90.2%), employment (88.0%), security (63.3%) and information (95.0%). These items combined impact directly and positively on the overall well-being.

Based on the foregoing findings, it is discernible that social capital certainly plays a valuable role in transforming the lives of people and communities facing economic difficulties. The readiness to assist another person is a demonstration of presence of operational community imperatives such as norms, trust and mutual co-existence. Prevalence of trust and norms of reciprocity compel community members to unite so that together they can solve challenges they encounter with the view to realizing outcomes that benefit everybody. Therefore, social capital is important in facilitating needy households and individuals move out of poverty. Access to these services and inputs is largely influenced by the high levels of social capital in the study area.

4.5.1 Social Capital and Mutual Support

Mutual support is a vital indicator of social capital since it is created through the social ties and expectation of reciprocity within a network of people connected by shared values and enjoying high mutual trust. In this study, mutual support was examined through
participants’ experiences and perceptions of willingness to engage in altruistic behavior by contributing to others’ well-being.

The survey questionnaire asked respondents five sets of questions on the social networks and mutual support category of social capital. First, whether members of the association or community helped each other out. The responses were ranked using the Likert Scale from “always helping” to “never helping”. Second, the likelihood that some people in the community or from the association would get together to help in case something unfortunate happened, such as severe sickness, or bereavement of a relative. The five responses ranged from “very likely” to “very unlikely”. Third, whether there are people other than the nearest family and immediate kinship members from whom one can approach and borrow money enough to pay for expenses for the household for one week and would be willing to provide. The responses were ranked from “definitely” to “definitely not”. Fourth, on whether social networks provided support to facilitate the resettlement of the internally displaced persons. The responses were either in the affirmative or otherwise. Fifth, the type of support received in case the response in the fourth question was affirmative.

The respondents demonstrated quite high levels of mutual support. For example, nearly 89.0 per cent of the sample indicated that members of their association and community always help each other out. Another substantial proportion of 87.5 per cent felt that it is highly likely that members of their community would be willing to provide support during an emergency. A female participant in a focus group discussion in respect to emergencies said:

*When we have an emergency like serious sickness at night, we usually call our neighbors to help us take the patient to hospital. In other cases we call*
them to come and keep watch on our children so that they are not left alone while we are in the hospital. (A female participant in focus group discussion, Nakuru County).

Another female participant in a focus group discussion from Uasin Gishu County said:

When there were only few bodabodas (motorbike taxis) in our village and you had plans to catch up with the bus as early as 4:30 in the morning, we would request to be escorted by the young men in our village.

Nearly 69.0 per cent also expressed confidence that they would receive support from outside relatives and friends. Only 9.0 per cent were completely uncertain of receiving support from outside their relatives and friends while 2.0 per cent expressed doubts and only 1.0 per cent of the households felt no one would be willing to help them.

Table 4.12: Social Networks and Mutual Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of members of community associations helping each other out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always helping</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping most of the time</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to provide help during emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from outside relatives and friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data
The link between social networks and mutual support is perhaps epitomized by the following sentiments of a male participant in a focus group discussion in Uasin Gishu County:

*Death, though inevitable, is a terrible experience. It devastates the bereaved not only emotionally but also economically. I can’t imagine how life would be if a bereaved household has nobody to turn to for help. I am glad that in our community we have funeral associations that step in to help households bury their deceased members. Neighbors also provide a lot of support in cash or in kind when a member loses a relative.*

More evidence that households indeed call on social networks and community associations during emergencies is given in a narration of the experience of one of the interviewees in a focus group discussion whose only house was completely burnt down.

*My house caught fire and got completely destroyed together with everything inside. It was a very difficult moment for me because I had lost everything I had. It rekindled the memories of the horrors of post-election violence because all my houses were burnt down. I was traumatized because my life seemed to be a life of misadventure. On that day my neighbor hosted me and the following day other people from the village organized themselves and in a period of one week they had put up a new house for and stocked it with household items. Everything was restored back as if nothing had happened.*

The in-depth analysis of the participants’ responses reveals that social networks are the primary forms of insurance that are used by poor people to smooth out the adverse effects of exigencies. It also reveals that norms of reciprocity, values such as being trustworthy, and the belief that other people will reciprocate are effective in the community. Consequently, people are able to exhibit attitudes of benevolence and make sacrifices in order to help others. This suggests that trust in neighbors and community, and
participation in network structures and associational ties may improve the quality of life for vulnerable households.

4.6  **IDPs Levels of Resettlement and Social Integration**

In the present study, resettlement refers to the process of ensuring that livelihoods and social systems of the displaced people are restored. In this study, measurement of level of resettlement and integration encompassed respondent’s own assessment of their Quality of Life (QOL) after resettlement. Quality of life denotes the degree of comfort, prosperity and material goods accessible for a person to live a healthy life. It includes not only material and physical well-being, but also social activities and as well as personal development and fulfillment.

According to Barnes (2011), several factors such as income, employment, education and health among others have been identified as factors that influence the quality of life. However, in the context of this study housing, which included ownership of the main dwelling and type of material used for housing and type of sanitation were used as some of the key indicators of resettlement. Other indicators were the extent to which the victims of displacement had recovered their livelihoods and the degree of social integration with the wider community in terms of involvement in community activities and the feeling of sense of community among IDPs.

Housing is a basic need of the population (RoK, 2000). In combination with other essential services, housing contributes significantly to better standards of living and household welfare. The study collected information on characteristics and ownership of
the main shelter in order to determine the housing situation as well as the victims’ level of resettlement.

Possession of a house accords the owner a sense of dignity, security and social status in the community. Ownership of houses by the victims of internal displacement is presented in Table 4.11. Interestingly, majority of the respondents, nearly 67.0 per cent, owned their homes and 10.3 per cent lived in houses that belonged to their relatives and another 23.0 per cent lived in rented houses. The differences in the ownership of homes could have been as a result of the rural-urban dichotomy in settlement. Although the data collected was not disaggregated into urban and rural areas, the respondents were from both rural and urban set up. It could be inferred that those respondents that said they owned the house(s) lived in rural areas while those that rented lived in the urban areas. This is true because a substantially large number of people in urban areas rent accommodation than in rural areas.

Renting of accommodation is not a common practice because most of the people live on family land. In addition, the prohibitive costs involved in constructing or purchasing a house in urban areas compels people to live in rented houses. This further, can be used to estimate the level of resettlement. For example, the majority of the households (71.0%) rated themselves as having fully resettled while 29.0 per cent of the total households rated themselves as not fully settled. This is reflected in the data on house ownership.

The type of materials used in construction determines the quality and durability of a house. The materials used can be indicative of whether the dwelling is temporary or permanent. In Kenya, the kind of materials used in construction is dictated by many
factors including region and culture, climate, and income status of the households (RoK, 2000). Across the households the housing materials were generally good reflecting that the quality of accommodation/housing used by the victims of internal displacement is also good.

Table 4.13: Respondents’ Level of Resettlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of settlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully settled</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fully settled</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by self</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs to a relative</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House wall material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks/Bricks/Stone/concrete/Cement</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/Timber</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House floor material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House roof material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron sheets</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straw/Thatch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of toilet owned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Closet(WC)/Flush toilet</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

There are significant differences in the type of walling materials used. For instance, almost 66.0 per cent lived in dwellings with blocks/bricks/stone or cement walls and 44.3 per cent live in houses with wood or timber walls. With respect to the type of floor, concrete was the most predominant type of flooring. Other types of floors were earth and tiles though not as widespread as concrete.
The most common material used for roofing is iron sheet. There is a higher percentage of households (nearly, 98.0 per cent) with iron sheets roof as compared to 3.3 per cent households with straw/thatch roofs. The cost involved in acquiring the different types of roofing material can perhaps explain the significant differences observed with regard to type of roofing material. Iron sheets are more readily available in the market as opposed to grass. Thus people would prefer to use materials that are readily available and accessible. In addition, cutting grass for roofing is not only laborious because of the quantity needed but also requires a person with the technical know-how of using grass to make a roof. These can force households to opt for iron sheets because of their availability, ease in fixing them and because they are more durable than grass.

Sanitation is a basic component of housing. It is on this understanding that the study collected information on the type of toilet used by the households in waste disposal and the source of water for drinking and domestic use. Information on type of toilet used by the households is crucial in determining whether or not the community has safe or unsafe sanitation. Poor sanitation, especially poor disposal of faecal matter increases the risk of transmission of pathogens and directly affects quality of health in the community.

According to the Norwegian Refugee Council (2008), human waste is a major source of pollution and water contamination, and is often responsible for various health problems and diseases such as diarrhea, dysentery and cholera. Therefore, the provision of proper sanitation services is of vital importance. Safe sanitation includes the use of flush toilets, covered pit latrine and Ventilated Improved Pit (VIP) latrine for waste disposal. Unsafe sanitation includes the use of bucket, polythene bags (flying toilets), or use of the bush as a means of waste disposal.
It is evident in Table 4.11 that the commonly used type of toilet by most IDPs was the pit latrine as compared to flush toilet. There is no evidence of using the bush thus signifying that the community is less exposed to pathogens that are transmitted through poor disposal of human faecal matter. It further implies that most of the IDPs have made significant strides in resettling.

Water for drinking and for other domestic uses was primarily supplied through non-piped services. At least 36.5 per cent indicated that rivers/streams were the main source of water for drinking and for household use. Nearly 27.0 per cent fetched water from wells. This was largely the case particularly for the respondents residing in the rural areas. During field research, women and children of school age were seen carrying water containers either from a well or a stream. This means that lack of piped water services in most of the communities where the study was carried has negative impacts on the well-being of the residents. Children may either miss attending school or report late as they may be involved in fetching water for household use. As a result, the chance to develop their human capital is lost or underutilized. Besides missing school, water from the well or a stream may be contaminated thus exposing families to serious health risks such as water borne infections.

While collecting data, an exercise that entailed crisscrossing villages, livestock and pets such as donkeys and dogs respectively were seen drinking water from the same streams where families fetched water for drinking and domestic use. Children were also seen swimming in the same streams. Some families practiced small-scale irrigation farming along the river banks. This poses a serious health hazard because in one place, a farmer was seen washing a knapsack very close to the river after spraying his tomatoes which he
had planted along the river bank. The risk of harmful chemicals used for spraying crops finding their way into the stream is increased especially when it rains since the chemical residuals are carried by runoff into the streams.

**Table 4.14: Sources of Water for Drinking and Domestic Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River/Stream</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water services</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private vendors</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosks</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data

In suburbs such as Langas, households obtained water from piped water services and also from private vendors and water kiosks. The data in Table 4.12 shows that 10.8 per cent and 11.0 per cent got their water for drinking and domestic use from piped water services and water kiosks. In some neighborhoods, especially in rented residential areas, taps with running water were seen installed in the compound. In other areas, many water containers were lined up mostly in the morning and in the evening around water kiosks.

Water vendors were also seen pushing carts that were fully loaded with water containers. Empirical data showed that 15.3 per cent of the sample purchased water from private vendors. This observation corresponds with the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2007) report that indicates that the water and sanitation situation in Kenya is poor with only 57.0 per cent of households using water from sources that are considered safe. The report further indicates that over 50.0 per cent of Kenya’s households do not have access to safe
drinking water in particular and the figure is much higher for the poor. The danger of buying water from private vendors is that there is no guarantee that such water is suitable for drinking and also for other domestic uses. In addition, there is a higher likelihood of getting contaminated on the way even if the source could be clean.

Generally, the results indicate the state and quality of housing for the IDPs is generally good which in turn signals that most of them are now settled. In the context of this study, the type of shelter is a robust parameter in assessing not only the level of resettlement but also other important aspects of well-being for the victims of internal displacement. Indeed, decent housing does not only improve the occupant’s physical well-being but it also enhances his/her social position in the society. Thus housing is not only a physical shelter but also plays a significant role in a person’s physical, mental, and emotional health conditions with regard to the qualitative dimensions provided by the shelter. From the above findings, it is reasonably evident that the resettled IDPs have gone through a transformation phase in terms of housing. Overall, the observations made in respect to quality of housing and sanitary facilities are of standards that could have a positive impact on their quality of life.

A comparison of the influence of group membership and respondents’ levels of resettlement in the two counties shows an almost uniform pattern in the levels of resettlement. Thus the percentage of the respondents that indicated that they were fully resettled in Nakuru County does not vary significantly with that of Uasin Gishu. As a matter of fact, the data in Table 4.13 shows the difference in resettlement in the two counties is marginal. This similarity is further accentuated by the fact that despite having
a “not settled” category in the questionnaire, none of the respondents in the two sampled counties indicated not to have resettled at all.

Table 4.15: Level of Resettlement in the Individual Sampled Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Whether belongs to a group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Fully settled</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uasin Gishu</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Not fully settled</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uasin Gishu</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

The corresponding results can be attributed to the two counties sharing common attributes in various aspects including social, economic and political attributes. This implies that whether an IDP is in Nakuru County or Uasin Gishu County, he or she has an equal chance of fully or partially resettling. In addition, belonging to a group has almost equal impact on IDPs resettlement in both counties. Further, it can be deduced that similar interventions can be appropriate to both localities without necessarily instituting modifications to suit either of the counties.

4.6.1 Livelihood Activities after Resettlement

During displacement, people often lose almost all forms of capital including natural, human, and social capitals (McDonald, 2006). The loss of these capitals impedes the local capabilities of the displaced people to reconstruct their livelihoods. Thus the recovery of the displaced people’s livelihoods was considered an important indicator of
resettlement because they shape outcomes of households’ welfare, for example, increased incomes.

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they had recovered in selected livelihood activities. These included farming, livestock keeping, business activities and employment. The data in Table 4.14 show substantial variations in the levels of recovery across the various livelihood activities. About 44.0 per cent of the households had somewhat recovered in farming and 23.0 per cent had fully recovered. However, nearly 2.0 per cent had somewhat not recovered while the remaining 32.0 per cent were yet to recover.

There was marginal improvement in the recovery of livestock keeping compared with farming/crop agriculture. Almost 30.0 per cent of the households had fully recovered in livestock keeping and another 52.5 per cent had somewhat recovered. Only 2.0 per cent had somewhat not recovered and 18.0 per cent had not recovered at all. The quantitative data on livelihoods were corroborated by data gathered through observation.

During field work agriculture was identified as the main land use and economic activity in both Nakuru county and Uasin Gishu county. The main agricultural activities observed were livestock farming, food and cash crop agriculture including horticulture and floriculture. In Nakuru County, the main food crops that were grown in the farms especially in Molo constituency were Irish potatoes, maize and beans were grown in almost all the areas visited. Other crops included vegetables such as cabbages, kales, spinach, onions and carrots. On the other hand, the main cash crops found in Nakuru County during field work was tea, particularly around Kuresoi North and Bahati
constituencies. Other cash crops that were grown are pyrethrum, wheat and flowers especially around Naivasha constituency.

Besides food crop and cash crop farming, livestock farming was also found to be a major land use and economic activity undertaken by a substantial number of residents in Nakuru County. In particular, dairy cattle were commonly seen grazing in the open fields in the different places where field research was conducted. Other types of livestock kept were sheep, pigs and few donkeys. Most of the households also kept poultry.

Other economic activities that were seen taking place at the time of field work were fishing especially in Lake Naivasha and logging and timber lumbering in Elburgon. The land use activities observed in Uasin Gishu County were less similar to those undertaken in Nakuru County. For example, in Ziwa ward of Soy constituency, extensive maize and wheat farms were seen. Also horticultural farming such as flower farming was being undertaken at the time of field work. Most of the households also kept dairy cows and sheep.

Of all the livelihood activities, business had the highest number of households that had fully recovered at 49.0 per cent. Another substantial number of households 43.7 per cent had somewhat recovered. Only a small proportion of 6.0 per cent had not recovered with the remaining 1.3 per cent having not somewhat recovered. This is too small for any significant comparison. The greater recovery in business is perhaps attributed to the quick returns associated with business as compared with crop farming that can take longer duration before maturity.
Table 4.16: Extent of Livelihoods Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully recovered</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat recovered</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not recovered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recovered</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livestock keeping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully recovered</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat recovered</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not recovered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recovered</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully recovered</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat recovered</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not recovered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recovered</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully recovered</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat recovered</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not recovered</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recovered</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data.

Employment is the principal means by which people express their productive capabilities to acquire the means of their survival (Slaus and Jacobs, 2011). Thus access to or recovery of remunerative opportunities is a crucial determinant of resettlement for the IDPs. Nearly half of the respondents had not recovered their employment. About 3.0 per cent also reported to have somewhat not recovered. Those that had somewhat recovered were 15.3 per cent while those that had fully recovered were 32.5 per cent.

The slow rate in recovery of employment can be attributed to capital flight associated with post-election violence that might have caused employment opportunities to shrink and organizations downsizing their workforce. Others might have been replaced
following their prolonged absence from work. A participant in a focus group discussion from Nakuru County said:

*I used to work in Naivasha in a flower farm (name of the farm withheld). As a result of post-election violence, I was not able to report back for nearly six months. When I finally decided to go back, I was shocked to be told that another person was employed to replace me. I had to look for alternative source of livelihood.*

### 4.6.2 Social Integration

Social integration refers to the norms and processes that allow people and groups equal and effective participation in the social, economic, cultural, and political life of societies. It is both an outcome and a process. Integration is an important indicator of resettlement. Social integration is a dynamic and principled process where all members are involved in dialogue with the view to achieving and maintaining peaceful coexistence. Therefore, social integration does not mean forced integration or forced incorporation (UNDESA, 2005). The extent to which IDPs were involved in community activities, their feelings of security and feelings of belonging to their community, were used as proxies for integration.

An important highlight from the data in Table 4.15 is that involvement in community work was generally high in the study area. Only 2.5 per cent of the respondents were not involved. This indicates presence of higher levels of social capital which is an important ingredient of collective action. Majority of the respondents 95.3 per cent participated in all community activities. However, 4.8 per cent of the respondents did not participate in all community activities because of either cultural (3.8%) or religious (1.0%) reasons. This is expected because cultural practices vary across communities. Since the population
in the study area is not ethnically homogeneous, such variations are anticipated. Similarly, religious beliefs can be a basis of exclusion depending on the belief system that an individual professes.

In terms of safety, nearly 45.0 per cent of the respondents felt very safe from crime and violence when alone at home and another 40.3 per cent moderately safe. About 7.0 per cent felt moderately unsafe and 4.5 per cent very unsafe. The remaining proportion was indifferent. There was marked difference in respondents’ opinion on feelings of safety while at home and when walking alone around the village/neighborhood after dark. For example, about 26.0 per cent of the respondents felt very safe representing a drop of 19.0 per cent when compared with similar opinion when at home.

A more or less similar pattern is observed in the group that felt moderately safe comprising 27.5 per cent as compared with 40.3 per cent while at home. The number of respondents that felt moderately unsafe doubled from 7.0 per cent while at home to 14.5 per cent while alone at night. Similarly, the percentage of those that felt very unsafe also rose from 4.5 per cent to 20.3 per cent for those at home in the evening and those out at night respectively. These results are consistent with the views of one of the respondents in one of the focus group discussions conducted in Langas neighborhood in the suburbs of Eldoret town:

*At night it’s better to just remain in your house rather than walk alone at night. You are safer at home because out there you may be attacked by bad people (criminals). If it’s absolutely necessary for you to go somewhere after dark, then it is better to ask for the company of your neighbor or a family member.*
### Table 4.17: Respondents’ Opinions on Social Integration

| N=400 |
|-----------------|--------|--------|
| **Social integration variables** | **Response** | **Percentage** |
| **Level of involvement in community activities** | | |
| Fully involved | 230 | 57.5 |
| Involved | 130 | 32.5 |
| Rarely involved | 30 | 7.0 |
| Not involved at all | 10 | 2.5 |
| **Participation in all community activities** | | |
| Yes | 19 | 4.8 |
| No | 381 | 95.2 |
| **Reasons for not participating** | | |
| Cultural | 15 | 3.8 |
| Religion | 4 | 1.0 |
| **Feeling of safety from crime and violence when alone at home** | | |
| Very safe | 179 | 44.8 |
| Moderately safe | 161 | 40.3 |
| Neither safe nor unsafe | 15 | 3.8 |
| Moderately unsafe | 27 | 6.8 |
| Very unsafe | 18 | 4.5 |
| **Feeling of safety when walking around the village alone after dark** | | |
| Very safe | 102 | 25.5 |
| Moderately safe | 110 | 27.5 |
| Neither safe nor unsafe | 22 | 5.5 |
| Moderately unsafe | 58 | 14.5 |
| Very unsafe | 108 | 27.0 |
| **Do you feel that you fully belong to this village/community?** | | |
| Yes | 319 | 79.8 |
| No | 81 | 20.2 |

**Source:** Survey Data

With regard to feelings of belonging to the community, nearly 80.0 per cent of the respondents provided a positive response. This is an important highlight that suggests IDPs are now congruent with other people, groups and the environment. Sense of belonging is an important element for mental health and social well-being. Ideally, a strong sense of belonging encourages positive social transactions that ultimately improve...
the welfare of individuals and households. It is a precursor for people to cooperate and act in the best interest of the community. It also alludes to the presence of high stocks of social capital.

4.7 **Sustainability of Social Capital**

Social capital is an outcome of networks and connectedness, membership of formalized groups and relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchange (Department for International Development, 1999). This implies that the main ingredients for sustaining social capital are mutual trust and reciprocity. Sustainability of social capital is one of the outputs of sustainable communities.

To determine whether social capital has been strengthened since resettlement, information on the ability of the IDPs to establish and maintain regular contact with families, friends and communities was collected. In this study, sustainability of social capital is proxied by sociability, sense of community and engagement. Social cohesion (feeling of togetherness), communication, interaction and participation in community activities were used as indicators of sociability and engagement.

The survey findings in Table 4.16 indicate that social interaction between friends and neighbours and community members remains strong for many respondents. The feeling of togetherness is also evident in the intensity of communication between community members. Apart from the traditional face-to-face type of interaction, the increased frequency of interaction obtains from access to modern communication devices such as mobile phones. For example, about 56.0 per cent of the respondents had made frequent telephone calls in the past month and another 44.5 per cent had occasionally made
telephone calls. Again, almost 72.0 per cent had received frequent telephone calls and nearly 29.0 per cent had occasionally received telephone calls.

Table 4.18: Feeling of Togetherness and Social Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of togetherness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very distant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat distant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither distant nor close</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat close</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very close</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often have you made telephone calls in the past month?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often have you received telephone calls in the past month?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often have you met with people in a public place to discuss issues or have food or drink?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often have people visited you in your home in the last one month?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often have you visited people in their home in the last one month?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

The role of mobile phones in promoting social interaction is clearly depicted by the following remarks by a participant in focus group discussion:

*With the use of mobile phone technology, social interaction and sharing of information with friends and neighbors regardless of the physical distance*
has never been this easy. Mobile phones have really helped in keeping us connected at all times. (A participant in focus group discussion in Nakuru County).

The results also suggest that the level of social cohesion is high in the study area with 57.0 per cent of the sample feeling very close to other members of the neighborhood. This reveals a steady pattern of communication which is important in sharing information. Consequently, trust is sustained among community members that in turn facilitate the accumulation and sustainability of social capital.

The level of sociability is also quite high. A large proportion of respondents 67.0 per cent indicated to have met with other people albeit occasionally in a public place to discuss issues or enjoy meals with another while 33.0 per cent did that frequently. Visiting other people and conversely being visited by other people is a strong characteristic of mutual trust and reciprocity. It suggests presence of effective norms of reciprocity which greases the wheels of social capital. From Table 4.16 it is evident that the sampled respondents not only do they regularly visit others, but they also regularly receive visitors. This trend is important in creating a viable environment for sustaining the existing stocks of social capital.

4.7.1 Collective Action

The substance of collective action is the willingness of residents in a neighborhood to participate in community activities for the common good. It implies that people residing in the same neighborhood or community trust one another and are ready and willing to be involved in community-wide programs or intervene in case of an emergency situation. However, it is important to note that not every form of collective action is an outcome of mutual trust and solidarity. In exceptional circumstances, especially in totalitarian
regimes, authorities can coerce people to participate in public work. In the context of this study, collective action consists of participation in community-organized activities that are aimed at providing public services.

To measure collective action, respondents were asked four sets of questions: (i) whether in the last 12 months they worked in the village to do something for the community; (ii) whether their participation in the activities was voluntary or required; (iii) How likely is it that people who do not participate in community work will be criticized or sanctioned? The responses for this particular question were measured using a five item Likert-type scale ranging from “very likely” to “very unlikely”, and (iv) respondents were asked to identify the most important factors that they thought helped people to live together and work together as a community in the village. The import of this question was to identify community level factors that promote social cohesion and ultimately sustainability of social capital in the study area. The data for this question is analyzed separately in subsection 4.7.2.

Most of the respondents (88.2%) had participated in community work in the previous twelve months. Only 11.8 per cent had not participated. On average, this is a high level of participation. Although the level of participation was high, majority of the respondents (47.0%) indicated that they participated because they were required to do so while 41.2 per cent said their participation was voluntary. This suggests presence of effective mechanisms for enforcing norms that get rid of free rider tendencies. Otherwise, the level of participation would be quite low. This finding is supported by the fact that 65.0 per cent of the respondents reported that there is greater probability that failure to participate
would invite criticism or ridicule against defaulters. The data in Table 4.17 presents the findings.

Table 4.19: Collective Action and Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community work in the last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of being criticized/ridiculed if do not participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither likely nor unlikely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

These findings are important because they reveal the ability of social capital to enforce norms of cooperation. The presence and strict enforcement of norms of collaboration is a vital requirement for civic engagement and social development. Such norms help in inculcating a sense of responsibility in individuals to be involved in collective activities and in eliminating the problems of tragedy of commons.

4.7.2 Determinants of sustainability of social capital

Table 4.20 shows the factors that were identified by the respondents as important in promoting the sustainability of social capital. At least eight (8) factors were identified as important in enabling people to live and work together as a community. Each of these factors determines the sustainability of social capital in a different way. Businesses were
identified by 16.0 per cent of the respondents. Perhaps this is because the success in business investments largely depends on “investing” in social relationships and networks which subsequently results in building of social capital.

The underlying purpose for developing social networks in businesses is to achieve economic returns. This happens in two important ways. First, social networks and relationships are channels through which information flows and this helps in reducing information asymmetries thus enabling investors to have strategic advantage in their operations. Secondly, investors benefit from social networks and relationships because through continuous interaction and sharing of information, transaction costs are lowered. For example, investors may spend less time finding new business contacts if social ties can act as intermediaries. These benefits may perhaps explain why businesses were identified as one of the important factors that make people in the study area to live as a community.

Community policing is an important indicator of collective efficacy. It was identified by 13.0 per cent of the respondent as an important factor of promoting a sense of community. It connotes the belief in the capacity of the community to regulate members’ behavior in accordance with the established norms as well as safeguard the general well-being of the community. It entails the capacity of residents to maintain peace and order. Community policing reduces levels of crime in a neighborhood. Communities that have low levels of crime have huge stocks of social capital and the converse. Indeed, Putnam (2001) argues that crime has a strong negative correlation with social capital at a state and community level.
Community policing influences development of generalized trust and widespread civic engagement. Moreover, the identification of social capital by the respondents is a manifestation of collective efficacy in the community. This means that there is effective social organization that unites people and activates social cohesion and trust with shared expectations of social control. Consequently, these processes yield social capital, strengthen and maintain it.

Table 4.20: Most Important Factors that help People Live Together as a Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural festivals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace crusades</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together in community</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

Education on the other hand can strengthen trust and influence the development of civic norms. This is consistent with Offe and Fuchs’ (2002) argument that learning (education) reduces uncertainty about the behavior of others, or if students are taught to behave cooperatively. At the more general level, it has been suggested that both formal and informal education act as mediators of social values and norms between human generations (Montgomery (ed.), 2000). Helliwell and Putnam (2007) identify education as one of the most important predictors of social capital. Other than educational attainments at the individual level, education institutions provide an avenue for residents
to interact and exchange ideas. Increased participation in school activities by parents, teachers and learners further cultivates trust and social cohesion in the community.

Intercultural festivals encourage social integration because they have the capacity to promote tolerance and openness to differences which is a pre-condition for sustaining social capital. In addition, such festivals create opportunities for interaction which is essential in the sustainability of trust, social cohesion and facilitating the flow of ideas and creativity. Overall, the high levels of trust and social cohesion engendered by intercultural festivals help in preventing conflicts and violence. Therefore, intercultural festivals as mentioned by the respondents have the advantage of enhancing the quality of social capital through social cohesion and civic engagement. A respondent from Uasin Gishu County reported the following with respect to cultural festivals:

*Cultural festivals promote social cohesion by bringing the different ethnic communities together. People share a lot and get interested in understanding the way of life of other people and in the end people begin to appreciate and respect others.*

Working together in community projects was identified by majority of the respondents (22.3%) as an important factor for uniting people in the community. Usually, when people come together to perform common tasks, repeated interaction with one another occurs and the resultant is the formation of strong ties and norms of reciprocity. These strengthen and improve the existing social capital. Again, as a result of communal approach to issues in the community, especially when tasks are accomplished, social capital building is likely to occur as a result of achievement and regular interaction.
Other factors that the respondents thought were important are intermarriages, peace crusades and religion. Through intermarriages, social ties to family, relatives, friends, and significant others are expanded. The expansion of such ties means that actors have access to a broader resource base. However, this is only likely in situations where actors have not contravened established social organization such as endogamy; otherwise they might experience disapproval and may not be allowed access to social resources embedded in those ties. Similarly, religion and peace crusades facilitate expansion of social networks thus promoting development of social capital. In addition, religion as a social institution fosters tolerance and openness to diversity. These are essential aspects necessary for creating and maintaining social capital.

4.8 Correlation Analysis

This section presents results of correlation tests between individual level socio-economic characteristics and social capital and also test of association between social capital and resettlement of IDPs. The correlation results for individual socio-economic characteristics and social capital are presented in Tables 4.19 through 4.24 while correlation results for social capital and resettlement are presented in Tables 4.25 and 4.26.

4.8.1 Determinants of Social Capital

It has been argued that focus on determinants of social capital constitutes the first step towards developing a consistent and integrated framework concerning the nature of social capital and its impact on socioeconomic performance (Christoforou, 2005). Helliwell, 1996; Brehen and Rahn, 1997; Krishna and Uphoff, 1999; Glaeser et al. 2000; and Rothstein and Stolle, 2001 empirically tested the impact of micro-level (individual level)
and aggregate level (community level) factors on the features of social capital namely; social trust and group membership. The contribution of this study is to analyze and provide insights on the determinants of social capital among the internally displaced populations in Kenya. For this purpose, a cross tabulation of group membership (indicator for social capital) on a set of individual socioeconomic characteristics was performed.

Since the determinants of social capital are categorized into two: the socio-economic characteristics of individuals such as age, personal income, employment, marital status and community level factors which determine the incentive of individuals to invest in groups and social networks (social capital), this section focuses only on individual-level determinants because community-level determinants are adequately addressed in the descriptive analysis section of this study. For example, in Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 cooperation and trust are highlighted as strong community-level determinants of social capital.

The individual-level factors of interest in this study are age, sex, marital status, level of education, employment, and personal income. These are in accordance to the relevant literature on determinants of social capital. The main objective of this section is to determine the set of individual factors that influence the formation of social capita among the IDPs. For this purpose, Chi-square and Pearson’s correlation coefficients were conducted to examine the relationship between the selected individual-level factors and social capital.
4.8.2 Age and Group Membership

Age features prominently in most empirical work on social capital. Empirical studies by Helliwell (1996); Brehm and Rahn (1997); Costa and Khan (2001) and Glaeser et al. (2001), provide evidence of the significance of age as a significant determinant social capital. With specific reference to this study however, such a relationship was not found to be significant. Table 4.19 show that the calculated Chi-square statistic is 3.751, the degrees of freedom are 2, and the reported significance level is 0.153 which is greater than the set alpha value of 0.05. This means that there is no relationship between an individual’s age and joining social groups and social networks (social capital).

Table 4.21: Cross Tabulation for Age by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of membership to a group or social network</th>
<th>Whether one belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28 years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-39 years</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α=0.05

χ² =3.751 df=2, p=0.153

The difference in the findings perhaps is as a result of the unique differences in the populations studied. The current study focused on internally displaced persons who have unique needs as compared with the general population. It is widely acknowledged in the literature that internally displaced persons are poor populations. The nature of their...
deprivation may therefore make them not attach any significance on age with regard to group membership because the main goal is to pool resources with the view to moving out of poverty.

4.8.3 Gender and Group Membership

Gender is another variable belonging to the range of individual factors. It denotes the socially ascribed roles of males and females. Gender is embedded in people’s beliefs that male and female sexes are by nature different and divergent social beings (Kiboro et al, 2014). These beliefs are turned into self-fulfilling prophecies through sex-role socialization where biological sexes are assigned distinct and often unequal work and political positions, and turned into socially distinct genders (Amott and Matthaei, 1991). This implies that gender is a crucial factor in social relationships and civic engagement; it determines to a greater extent a person’s overall well-being in terms of access to resources and opportunities.

Previous studies have shown that women tend to have significantly lower levels of overall civic participation in formal networks (Christoforou, 2005). However, as regards informal social networks, it is stated that it is easier for women to find consolation when depressed and financial relief when in need of money (Fidrmuc and Gerxhani, 2005). Therefore, it is on this basis that tests on the association between gender and group membership (social capital) among internally displaced persons were deemed necessary because of the contextual variations with regard to environment and circumstances which IDPs find themselves in. A cross tabulation of gender against group membership was done and results presented in Table 4.20. The results show that there is no association between gender and social capital among the population studied.
Table 4.22: Cross Tabulation for Gender by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\alpha = 0.05$

$\chi^2 = 0.671 \text{ d.f.}= 2, \ p=0.240$

The results in Table 4.20 indicate that the Chi-square statistic is 0.671, the degrees of freedom are 2 and the reported significance level is 0.240 at 5.0 per cent level. This implies that in the studied population, gender is not a determinant of social capital. These results do not correspond with the other studies on determinants of social capital. Christoforou (2005), for example, compared the determinants of social capital in Greece to other countries of the European Union and found that gender was a statistically significant determinant of social capital.

4.8.4 Marital status and Group Membership

Marital status is another variable that was cross-tabulated with group membership. The calculated Chi-square statistic in Table 4.21 is 41.868, the degrees of freedom are 2, and the reported significance level is 0.000. This indicates that at 5 per cent level there is a statistically significant association between marital status and social capital. This means that marriage increases the likelihood of being a member of a group. These results tend to agree with other studies on whether marital status is a determinant of social capital and also disagree with others. For example, Parts (2003) and Kaasa and Parts (2008), in their
investigations on the dynamics and determinants of social capital in the European Union and neighboring countries and marital status was found to be an important and statistically significant determinant of social capital.

Contrary to the expectation that married couples are less likely to participate in social groups as family obligations take much of their time thus serving as a disincentive for relations outside the household, the results for this study instead show that marriage increases the probability of being a member of a group. Hence, household obligations do not reduce incentives for group membership.

Table 4.23: Cross Tabulation for Marital Status by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\alpha = 0.05$

$\chi^2 = 41.868 \ df=2, \ p=0.000$
4.8.5 Level of Education and Group Membership

The significance of education as a determinant of social capital has widely been studied. This is confirmed in the literature by empirical studies such as that of Helliwell (1996), Brehm and Rahn (1997), Glaeser et al. (2000), Costa and Khan (2001) and Rothstein and Stolle (2001). These studies however, were based on information from the general population not characterized with special needs like displaced populations. Since this study used data gathered from a population of internally displaced persons, it was necessary to perform correlation analysis of education against group membership.

The cross tabulation results in Table 4.22 show that the calculated Chi-square value is 24.075, the degrees of freedom are 3 and the reported significance level is 0.000. Since the significance level is less than 5 per cent or (0.05), it suggests that there is statistically significant association between education and social capital. These results are consistent with those of the studies mentioned. The results also agree with Knack and Keefer (1997) and Paldam (2000) argument that higher education has a stronger probability for group membership.

Education is viewed as a factor for developing opportunities for collective action, either through providing access to social networks and personal acquaintances, or by generating values and morals leading to a sense of citizenship and solidarity (Christoforou, 2005). According to Uslaner (1995; 2003), education may strengthen trust and civic norms. Education has also been generally described as a mediator of social values and norms between human generations (Montgomery, 2000).
Table 4.24: Cross Tabulation for Education by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary school (college)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\alpha = 0.05$

$\chi^2 = 24.075 \text{ df}=3, p=0.000$

The relationship between education and social capital is further supported in the literature. For example, Buerkle and Guseva (2002) show that the social component of education in terms of friends, acquaintances and other connections accumulated while in school is important and significant.

People who have been in school are better able to make valuable contacts relatively easily while it is much more costly for a person to forge similar contacts without having gone to school. Cameron and Heckman (2001) points out that people who stay in school longer have a lower cost of investment in social capital. Education also equips individuals with better communication skills and exposures thus making it easier for them to establish contacts.
4.8.6 Employment and Group Membership

A cross tabulation of employment against group membership shows no relationship between employment and group membership. These results are consistent with the findings of previous studies. For example, Brehn and Rahn (1997) and Christoforou (2005) found out that being unemployed creates a stronger disincentive for group membership.

Table 4.25: Cross Tabulation for Employment by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\alpha = 0.05$

$\chi^2 = 0.592 \ df=1, \ p=0.261$

The unemployed may lack income to afford group membership or they may spend their leisure looking for jobs or trying to secure source of minimum wages, rather than participating in groups. Unemployment can also make people develop distrust towards other social groups and society in general because they may be considered to have deprived them of opportunities for employment.
4.8.7 Income and Group Membership

A cross tabulation of income against group membership shows a positive and statistically significant relationship.

Table 4.26: Cross Tabulation Results for Income and Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Whether belongs to any group or social network</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10000</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-30000</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-400000</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \alpha = 0.05 \)

\( \chi^2 = 17.050 \) df=3, p=0.001

The information in Table 4.24 shows that the calculated Chi-square value is 17.050, the degrees of freedom are 3 and the significance level is 0.001. Therefore, at 5 per cent significance level there is a statistically significant relationship between income and group membership. Therefore, it can be argued that the higher the income the greater the probability of joining groups. People with higher levels of income are more likely to afford group membership. This implies that so as to enhance social capital, it is imperative to invest in job creation programmes with the view to creating opportunities for earning income.
Although a positive relationship is observed between income and social capital, it is worth to note that at times income can have a negative effect on social capital formation. For example, there is an opportunity cost aspect that can negate the formation of social capital. Individuals who are able to afford better home security system can use it to substitute for the time spent to getting to know one’s neighbours. Similarly, people with higher income can afford to substitute social capital with other forms of insurance during bad times (Grootaert et al. 2002).

4.9 Social Capital and Resettlement of IDPs

As one of the primary tasks of this study was to establish whether social capital influences the resettlement of internally displaced persons, a correlation test was carried out to establish whether any association between social capital and resettlement exists. To achieve this, trust being one of the most important and widely discussed component of social capital was used as the proxy of social capital. The other feature used a proxy of social capital was the support or help provided during the resettlement process. The following question was asked to capture information on trust “In general, do you agree with the following statement? Most people in this village can be trusted”. The respondents were required to use Likert’s five point scale where 1 meant agree strongly and 5 disagree strongly.

The question on support was “After you were internally displaced you later decided to return to your former habitual place of residence or resettled elsewhere. Did you receive any support from your association or networks to facilitate your resettlement?” The information obtained from the two questions was used to run cross tabulation of social
capital against resettlement. The results are presented in Table 4.25 and Table 4.26 respectively.

The results in Table 4.25 show that there is a statistically significant association between trust (social capital) and resettlement of internally displaced persons at 5 per cent level. This means that social capital is an important asset particularly to the marginalized and vulnerable populations.

**Table 4.27: Cross Tabulation for Aggregate trust by Level of Settlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate trust</th>
<th>Fully settled</th>
<th>Not fully settled</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\alpha = 0.05$$

$$\chi^2 = 23.709 \text{df}=4, \ p=0.000$$
Table 4.28: Cross Tabulation for Social Support by Level of Settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Support</th>
<th>Level of settlement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully settled</td>
<td>Not fully settled</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α = 0.05

$\chi^2 = 8.337$ df=1, p=0.005

Regarding whether there is an association between support/help provided as an independent variable and the dependent variable (resettlement), the results in Table 4.26 by and large conform with the expectations, other things being equal, that support or help provided to the internally displaced persons positively influences the resettlement of IDPs. This implies that for many households, resources acquired through social relations and social support is significant in their resettlement process. It further shows that the villages or neighborhoods have residents who are concerned about others and can be depended on by others in times of need.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Literature confirms that displacement entails disruption in the social and economic organization of people. Displaced populations are often exposed to a number of potential risks that may push them to hardship and poverty. These include loss of jobs, homelessness, increased exposure to health risks, food insecurity, marginalization, and loss of human rights among others (Gutman, 1994; Cernea, 1995; Downing, 2002). Involuntary displacement causes enormous losses in income, property and even lives. Besides causing losses in physical property, it is also responsible for loss of non-material goods such as cultural heritage, social capital, identity and association to a particular place. Its consequences on the victims are far-reaching. The affected end up being impoverished, isolated, and excluded from accessing essential services such as health care, education and security among other services.

To cope with the challenges of displacement, the victims of internal displacement employ various survival strategies. The common approach is to come together into associative life mainly in voluntary community groups and associations in order to meet their daily needs (OCHA Kenya, 2009). These voluntary associations serve to compliment the role of informal institutions (kinships) by enabling members to articulate their wants and to accrue both monetary benefits and social competences that are essential for supporting their well-being initiatives. According to Putnam (1993), voluntary associations contribute to the formation of social capital by instilling in their members habits of
cooperation, solidarity and public spiritedness because such associations create networks that promote the spread of social trust throughout the society.

This research aimed at critically examining the influence of social capital in form of affiliations to social groups and social networks in enhancing the material well-being and living conditions of the internally displaced persons. In order to critically analyze the impact of social capital in the resettlement of IDPs in Kenya, the study adopted Granovetter’s (1973) theory of social networks and Olson’s (1965) theory of collective action and rational choice theory as a more suitable theoretical framework to understand how groups and social networks and the resources that circulates through them contribute to actor’s well-being. Hence the focus of attention was on the immediate benefits that actors obtained through their relationships and membership into voluntary groups and social networks and how their everyday interactions shaped their economic and resettlement outcomes. Hence, this chapter presents a summary of the study findings, main conclusions and recommendations. Section 5.2 provides a summary of the study purpose and findings; section 5.3 makes conclusions from the findings; section 5.4 presents the contribution to knowledge and section 5.5 provides recommendations for policy formulation and for further research.

5.2 Summary
The research investigated the contribution of social capital in the resettlement of internally displaced persons. Specifically the study investigated factors that influenced the formation of social capital among the displaced persons in Kenya, analyzed the type(s) of social capital that impacted on the resettlement of the displaced persons, assessed the impact of social capital on improving the welfare of households of the
victims of internal displacement, and also explored factors responsible for the sustainability of the existing social capital. Primary data of both quantitative and qualitative nature were collected. The data used were collected at the household level and from the village level (from members of community groups, officials of the community groups and community leaders).

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to measure social capital and other variables important to the study. Factors influencing formation of social capital were determined through cross tabulation of individual-level socio-economic characteristics against belong to community groups. Types of social capital were analyzed descriptively by examining patterns of social interaction between groups with similar and different characteristics. Impact of social capital on the victim’s household’s welfare was assessed by cross tabulation between social capital proxied by trust and social support against resettlement. Factors promoting the sustainability of the existing social capital were assessed through the level of sociability, sense of community and engagement.

The study first sought to capture the demographic information of the respondents. The results indicate that the sample studied comprised a fairly young population and falls within the economically active group since the majority of the household heads were between 29 years and 39 years old. Majority of the respondents, nearly 67.0 per cent had attained secondary school education and nearly 18.0 per cent had post-secondary education. This means that the studied population is characterized by high levels of literacy.
However, the study revealed that despite impressive literacy levels, a large proportion of the respondents were not employed in the formal sector. As a result, average monthly incomes were low for most of the households with the majority almost 60.0 per cent earning an average monthly income that ranged between Ksh. 0-10,000. This is far too little to be able to cater for all the household needs. Consequently, members have to be creative and come up with alternatives for survival.

The study found out that because of the inability to meet all the household needs and in order to stave off the adverse effects of shocks individuals join groups and social networks as their primary form of insurance. Hence, it is evident from the findings that people have more access to social affiliations. Nearly 74.0 per cent of the households interviewed were affiliated to social groups. The study also found that the criteria for joining such groups greatly varied from voluntary membership to being invited to being required to join. The greatest impediment to joining groups was the inability to afford membership fee. This was confirmed in the in-depth interviews.

The study also tested empirically the reasons as to why the respondents affiliated themselves to community groups. The evidence generated shows that households joined social groups for various purposes. This research established that 37.0 per cent were compelled to belong to community groups in order to improve their household’s livelihood and so that they could access basic services. Others joined groups because they considered them the primary insurance during emergency. Other reasons identified by the respondents were to fulfill spiritual, social status and self-esteem. Only one respondent mentioned recreation as the main purpose for joining groups. This suggests that the
majority of the respondents had more pressing needs that could not allow them to engage in leisure activities.

With respect to the characteristics of the groups in terms of membership, the analysis shows that there is greater heterogeneity. According to literature, this is an important aspect of groups since the more heterogeneous the groups, the greater the benefits to the members (Grootaert, et al. 2002). Moreover, in heterogeneous groups, the propensity for building trust which is necessary for encouraging mutual cooperation is high (Knowles, 2005).

Further study findings show that a significant proportion of the respondents (74.0%) believed that the greatest number of people residing in the village could be trusted. Hence there is a high prevalence of generalized trust which is an important requirement for generating norms of reciprocity and cooperation among community members. However, the results for particularized trust are mixed. The results show that there is a greater likelihood for people to trust other people from their own ethnic groups compared to people from other ethnic groups. People also trust government officers more than strangers and non-governmental organisations. Many people demonstrated low levels of trust on matters of lending and borrowing money. In-depth interviews corroborate this finding by indicating that the probability of defaulting to re-pay the borrowed money is high; as such, people are reluctant to take the risk of lending out their money to their neighbours.

In terms of the extent of resettlement, the study found out that the majority of the respondents (71.0%) rated themselves as having fully settled and 29.0 per cent not fully
resettled. In terms of housing, nearly 67.0 per cent indicated they owned their homes while 23.0 per cent lived in rented houses. The remaining proportion was still hosted by their relatives. The quality of housing for most of the respondents was found to be generally of modest quality. Nearly 66.0 per cent lived in brick houses. Concrete was the most predominant type of flooring while the most common roofing material was iron sheets.

The study also investigated the quality of sanitation and found out that most of the residents in the sample use pit latrine in disposing faecal matter. There was no evidence of using the bush to dispose of faecal matter. Overall, the results indicated that the type of housing and sanitation for most of the respondents are of good standards.

Results on the extent to which the IDPs had recovered their livelihoods indicated variations in the recovery of selected livelihoods. Most of the IDPs had fully recovered in business activities and in employment. However, in crop farming and livestock husbandry, the majority indicated they had somewhat recovered. In terms of social integration, nearly 80.0 per cent of the respondents expressed feeling of belonging to the community. A substantial proportion of respondents (95.2%) indicated they were involved in community activities.

5.2.1 Determinants of Social Capital

The first objective of the study was to investigate factors that influence the formation of social capital among IDPs. With regard to the determinants of social capital, the study established that both aggregate level and some micro-level factors influenced the formation of social capital. Social trust, membership into community groups, and
collective action were found to be the most important community-level factors that influenced the building of social capital among the IDPs. On micro-level factors, the cross tabulation results show a statistically significant relationship between marital status, education and income on social capital formation. The results, however, did not show any statistical significance of age, gender and employment as far as social capital formation was concerned.

### 5.2.2 Types of Social Capital

The second objective sought to analyze the types of social capital that impact on the resettlement of the internally displaced persons. The results showed that among the population studied, three types of social capital are present: bonding social capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital. However, bonding social capital is most prevalent than the other two. Bridging social capital appeared to be second in terms of prevalence and then linking social capital. Bonding social capital helped in mobilizing resources necessary for resettlement from close relatives and immediate neighbours while bridging social capital attracted resources from horizontal networks. Linking social capital on the other hand enabled mobilization of resources from people in authority.

### 5.2.3 Impact of Social Capital on Household Welfare

The third objective sought to assess the impact of social capital in improving the welfare of households of victims of internal displacement. The results derived from the study indicate that social capital had enormous positive influence towards the resettlement of the IDPs. Empirical evidence shows that majority of the households benefitted from social capital in accessing education, health services, water supply and sanitation, credit, agricultural inputs, building materials, food supply and information among other services
and resources. Overall, social capital in form of social networks and community associations were found to be instrumental in improving the household welfare of most of the IDPs. Further the findings show that as a result of social capital, mutual support is engendered. Nearly 89.0 per cent indicated that members of their association and community always help each other out and that there is a higher likelihood that a member of the community would be willing to provide support during an emergency. In-depth interviews also revealed a strong link between social capital and improved household welfare. Overall, the results show that social capital had a strong and positive effect on the resettlement of internally displaced persons. Thus the role of social capital in the context of resettlement of the displaced populations is very significant. The results derived from this study have indicated that social capital in form of trust (both generalized and particularized) and cooperative norms is basic in reducing the level of vulnerability that often characterizes displaced populations.

5.2.4 Sustainability of Social Capital

The fourth objective was to explore the factors responsible for the sustainability of the existing social capital. The study found out that social interaction, feeling of togetherness i.e. sense of community, collective action and cooperation are important factors that promote the maintenance and sustainability of social capital. The survey revealed that social interaction between neighbours and community members is intense. The feeling of togetherness was found to be strong as evidenced by the intensity of communication between community members.

The level of sociability was also found to be high. For example, nearly 67.0 per cent of the sample showed that they occasionally met other people in a public place to discuss
issues or enjoy meals together. They also frequently visit other people thus strengthening mutual trust and reciprocity. These help in strengthening and sustaining the existing social capital. Participation in community activities for the common good was also found to be a critical component of sustaining social capital. The findings showed that 88.2 per cent of the sample had taken part in community work in the past twelve months.

The study further identified specific aspects that the respondents considered important in promoting sustainability of the existing social capital. At least eight (8) factors were identified as having the ability to bring people together. The respondents felt that business activities promoted the development of social networks and relationships which in turn contribute to steady interaction and sharing of information. Community policing was also identified as important in sustaining social capital because it encourages collective efficacy where community members become each other’s brother/sister’s keeper. It therefore promotes a strong sense of community. Education is another factor mentioned by the respondents as vital in the maintenance and promotion of social capital because it encourages development of civic norms and strengthens trust. Consequently, uncertainty about other people’s behavior is reduced and people are taught to behave cooperatively.

The study also revealed that intercultural festivals are important in maintaining social capital. Such festivals encourage social integration by promoting tolerance and openness to differences which is considered a necessary pre-condition for sustaining social capital. Working together in community projects was also identified as critical in uniting people. As a result of working together, strong ties and norms of reciprocity develop. Other factors identified were intermarriages, peace crusades and religion. Through
intermarriages, social ties to family, relatives, friends, and significant others are expanded. The expansion of such ties means that actors have access to a broader resource base and a sense of “we feeling” is cultivated. Overall, the study found that the high degree of trust and sociability characterized by intense interaction and participation (wider involvement) in community activities help in promoting social cohesion and consequently the sustainability of social capital.

5.3 Conclusions
Displacement causes certain changes in people’s social and economic organization. The impact of displacement is in most cases devastating especially after the government and other non-governmental agencies withdraw their support. This study has revealed that in absence of institutional support, IDPs make use of their acquired social capital to resettle. Their social networks serve as the primary forms of insurance that they depend on to smooth out the adverse effects of unforeseen exigencies. It also reveals that norms of reciprocity, values such as being trustworthy, and the belief that other people will reciprocate are essential features of community life. Subsequently, people are able to exhibit attitudes of benevolence and make sacrifices in order to help others in times of need. This suggests that trust in neighbors and community, and participation in network structures and groups may improve the quality of life for vulnerable households. Based on this key finding, several conclusions can be drawn from the analysis.

First, is the fact that social capital matters a lot in improving the well-being of the vulnerable households and especially for the IDPs. The cross tabulation results showed a statistically significant association between social capital and resettlement of IDPs. A key factor of securing livelihoods reported by the vast majority was the need for networks or
contacts through social ties. Social networks and groups were found to be effective in reducing the struggle for securing livelihoods for the displaced people. Further, it was observed that IDPs depended on social networks for support and exchanging information on work and services.

Secondly, social capital is an outcome of both individual/household level and community level factors. As such, factors that affect household social capital certainly affect the overall community social capital. Therefore to promote formation of social capital at both levels (household and community), there is need to provide incentives at both levels. For example, promoting participation of poor households in local level associations and encouraging community-wide events such as community festivals can enhance trust among community members.

Thirdly, empirical evidence has shown that in situations where institutional support is either weak or absent, social capital in the form of membership in local associations contribute to higher household welfare outcomes thus reducing the probability of being poor. Thus social capital can be described as the capital of the poor. For example, many IDPs received material support that enabled them to resettle and meet other household demands from their groups and social networks.

Fourthly, social capital acquired by the IDPs is crucial for establishing bonding, bridging and linking ties at both household and group level. These are particularly important especially in the resettlement process because they link victims of displacement with the necessary resources for resettlement. The improved access to resources and services
further enhances the victims’s capacity to reconstruct their livelihoods which are potentially vital for the achievement of sustainable resettlement.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

This study makes useful input to the growing literature on the importance of social capital for vulnerable populations. It is among the few studies to examine the influence of social capital in resettlement of internally displaced persons. The study contributes to the body of literature on social capital in livelihoods recovery for the poor households. It provides an understanding of how people displaced by political violence are able to create social capital and use it in the reconstruction of their lives. Further, the study distinguishes between bonding, bridging and linking social capital in the context of internal displacement and examines their contribution in improving the household welfare of the victims of displacement.

The findings derived from the study have important theoretical, policy and practical implications. For example, they provide evidence concerning theoretical arguments about the utility difference between bonding, bridging and linking capital as well as evidence about factors that influence social capital formation especially among vulnerable populations. Such knowledge can be useful in community organizing and neighborhood improvement programs.

The knowledge about the impact of the three types of social capital mentioned can be useful in formulating pro-poor policies for poverty reduction. Additionally, understanding of factors influencing social capital formation can inform policy makers
and other social service actors on the potential barriers of social capital formation and therefore incorporate them into program interventions.

### 5.5 Policy Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

i. Marital status, income and education seem to be most influential socio-economic factors of social capital formation among victims of internal displacement. Therefore, encouraging overall economic growth and investments in social development would boost incomes and promote sustainable marriages. Similarly, investment in effective education systems is crucial because it could increase school enrolment rates which ultimately would have positive effects in the development of social capital.

ii. The government and other agencies should invest in strengthening the capacities of local associations and community groups. This would have positive effects on social capital development especially in communities with many poor households but with large numbers of active and registered social groups. Such groups can be provided with both software and hardware support in terms of training and skills development and financial resources.

iii. Since membership in community groups has the ability to insure families from emergencies and other unforeseeable circumstances, government
together with other actors including the civil society should initiate interventions that seek to encourage broader participation in grassroots associations with greater focus on the poor populations whose sources of livelihoods are vulnerable.

iv. The low rating of linking social capital based on the study findings is an indication that institutional support from the government is largely insufficient. It is therefore necessary for the government to set aside a fund for addressing such outcomes of internal displacement adequately without unnecessarily subjecting the victims to prolonged suffering.

v. It has emerged that social capital engenders civic attitudes and values that occupy a prominent place in democratic societies. Therefore, it is important that civic education programs in Kenya should be designed in such a way that there is adequate incorporation of dimensions of social capital with a view to strengthening and sustaining the already existing stocks of social capital.

vi. The findings suggest that social capital should be integrated as an essential component in both national and local level poverty reduction policies and programs.

5.6 Recommendations for Further Research

The current study only considered the impact of social capital on the resettlement of internally displaced persons. Future studies could consider carrying out similar studies on
different populations other than the displaced populations and on different issues other than displacement and resettlement. Comparative studies on social capital with different groups and on different issues would perhaps provide a more in-depth and global (comprehensive) understanding of social capital. This will provide the government and other stakeholders with relevant information for formulating policies on social development and national cohesion.

Social capital is a broad concept with many dimensions. Consequently, measuring social capital is a complex exercise. For example, this study would have wished to measure as many dimensions of social capital as possible including online ties. However, the design of the instruments used did not provide means for integrating online ties into the study. Today, internet has become embedded in people’s lives and has significantly influenced the emergence of virtual ties which could have instrumental value such as resolving the problem of information asymmetry among the users. Hence studies can be carried out to assess the contribution of online social capital on the resettlement of displaced populations.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Questionnaire For Individual Respondents

I am a doctorate student from the University of Nairobi. I am carrying out a study on the impact of social capital in the resettlement of IDPs in Kenya. To participate in this study you are requested to spare little time to answer the questions in this questionnaire. I wish to notify you in the earliest instance that your specific responses will be completely anonymous. However, your views, in combination with those of others are extremely important for analytical purpose. As you give your views, you are reminded that there is no right or wrong answers and that you have the option not to provide your name in order to guarantee greater anonymity.

IDENTIFICATION

Interviewer’s name ……………………………………………

Interviewer’s number …………………………………………

Date: ……………………………………………………………

LOCATION

County:  (a) Nakuru   [  ]

(b) Uasin Gishu  [  ]

Constituency ………………………………………

Constituency Ward ……………………………

Village Unit ………………………………………
SECTION A: Respondent/Household Characteristics (Determinants of Social Capital)

1. Name of the household member (Optional)

2. Relationship to the household
   (a) Head [  ]
   (b) Spouse [  ]
   (c) Son [  ]
   (d) Daughter [  ]
   (e) Relative [  ]
   (f) Other (Please specify) ..........................................................

3. Age in years? ...........................................

4. Sex?
   (a) Male [  ]
   (b) Female [  ]

5. Marital status?
   (a) Single [  ]
   (b) Married [  ]
   (c) Divorced [  ]
   (d) Separated [  ]

6. Highest level of education?
   (a) None [  ]
   (b) Primary school [  ]
   (c) Secondary school [  ]
(d) Post-secondary school (college) [ ]
(e) University [ ]
(f) Other (Please specify)………………………………………………

7 Are you employed?
(a) Yes [ ]
(b) No [ ]

8 What is your estimate monthly income in Ksh? ……………………

SECTION B: Groups and Social Networks (Forms of Social Capital)

9. I would like to start by asking you about the groups or organizations, networks, or
associations to which you or any member of your household belongs. These could be
formally organized groups of people who get together regularly to do an activity or
discuss issues. Do you or any member of your household belong to such group(s)?
(If NO, go to question 21).
(a) Yes [ ]
(b) No [ ]

10. If YES, what is the name(s) of the group(s)?
   (a) Group one
       ……………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   (b) Group two
       ……………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   (c) Group Three
       ……………………………………………………………………………………………………..
11. Which year did you join the group(s)?

(a) Group One…………………………………………………………

(b) Group Two…………………………………………………………

(c) Group Three…………………………………………………………

12. How does one become a member of this/these groups? *(Please tick as appropriate)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Group one</th>
<th>Group two</th>
<th>Group three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Born into the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Required to join</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Voluntary choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What is the main purpose for joining this group (s)?

(a) To improve my household’s current livelihood or access to services  [ ]

(b) As insurance in times of emergency  [ ]

(c) To benefit the community  [ ]

(d) For enjoyment/Recreation  [ ]

(e) For spiritual, social status and self-esteem  [ ]

(f) Other *(Please specify)*

……………………………………………………………………………
14. Use **YES** or **NO** to fill the following table. Thinking about the membership of these groups, are most of them of the same…

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ethnic or linguistic group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Education background or level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Neighborhood/village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Family or kin group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Political viewpoint or same political party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Marital status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Does your group work or interact/network with other groups with similar goals **IN** the village/neighborhood?

   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]

16. Does your group work or interact/network with other groups with similar goals **OUTSIDE** the village/neighborhood?

   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]

17. Does this group work or interact/network with other groups with different goals **IN** the village/neighborhood?

   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]
18. Does this group work or interact/network with other groups with different goals OUTSIDE the village/neighborhood?
   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]

19. Does your group work or interact/network with people in positions of authority (e.g. the police, political leaders, local government officials, central government officials)?
   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]

20. Does your group or organization work or interact with any institutions that are non-governmental but outside the community?
   (a) No [ ]
   (b) Yes, occasionally [ ]
   (c) Yes, frequently [ ]

21. In every community, some people get along with others very well and trust each other, while it is also true that other people do not. Now, I would like to talk to you about trust and solidarity in your community.

   In general, do you agree or disagree with the following statements in the table? Use a five point scale where 1 means Agree strongly and 5 means Disagree strongly.
a) Most people who live in this village can be trusted

b) In this village, one has to be alert; else someone is likely to take advantage of you

c) Most people in this village are willing to give help if you need it

d) In this village, people generally do not trust each other in matters of lending and borrowing money

| 22. Now I want to ask you how much you trust different types of people. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means to a very small extent and 5 means to a very great extent, how much do you trust people in the following categories. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. To a very small extent | 2. To a small extent | 3. Neither small nor great extent | 4. To a great extent | 5. To a very great extent |
| a) People from your ethnic or linguistic group |  |  |  |  |
| b) People from other ethnic or linguistic groups |  |  |  |  |
| c) Police |  |  |  |  |
| d) Strangers |  |  |  |  |
| Non-governmental officials |  |  |  |  |
| Government officials |  |  |  |  |
SECTION C: Impact of Social Capital on Household Welfare

At this point, I would like to talk to you about the benefits your household has obtained in the last FIVE years as a result of your membership into a group, association or a network or from any other group that you are not a member. These could be actual benefits obtained or potential benefits that you or your household can obtain.

23. Has the group, association or network that you belong to helped you or your household get access to any of the following services? Use YES or NO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply and sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit or savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural inputs or technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House construction materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. How well do members of your association or community help each other out? Use a five point scale, where 1 means always helping and 5 means never helping.

1. Always helping  [  ]
2. Helping most of the time  [  ]
3. Helping sometimes  [  ]
4. Rarely helping  [  ]
5. Never helping  [  ]

25. Suppose that something unfortunate happened to you, such as serious illness, or death of your relative. How likely is it that some people in the community or from your association would get together to help you?

   a) Very likely  [  ]
   b) Somewhat likely  [  ]
   c) Neither likely nor unlikely  [  ]
   d) Somewhat unlikely  [  ]
   e) Very unlikely  [  ]

26. If you suddenly needed to borrow a small amount of money enough to pay for expenses for your household for one week; are there people other than your immediate household and close relatives to whom you could turn to and would be willing to provide this money?

   a) Definitely  [  ]
   b) Probably  [  ]
   c) Unsure  [  ]
   d) Probably not  [  ]
   e) Definitely not  [  ]
27. After you were internally displaced you later decided to return to your former place of habitual residence or resettled elsewhere. Did you receive any support from your association or networks to facilitate your resettlement?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]

28. If YES, what type of support did you receive?
   a) ……………………………………………………………………………..
   b) …………………………………………………………………………….
   c) ……………………………………………………………………………
   d) ……………………………………………………………………………..

SECTION D: Sustainability of Social Capital (Sociability)

I am now going to ask a few questions about your everyday social interactions

29. How is the feeling of togetherness or closeness in your village? Use a five point scale where 1 means feeling very distant and 5 means feeling very close.
   a) Very distant [ ]
   b) Somewhat distant [ ]
   c) Neither distant nor close [ ]
   d) Somewhat close [ ]
   e) Very close [ ]

30. About how many close friends do you have these days? These are people you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or can call on for help.

______________________________
31. In this question, am going to ask you about your social interaction with other people in the past month.

a) Approximately how many times have you made a telephone call in the past month?  

b) Approximately how many times have you received a telephone call in the past month?  
c) Approximately how many times have you met with people in a public place to discuss issues or have food or drinks?  
d) Approximately how many times have people visited you in your home in the last one month?  
e) Approximately how many times have you visited people in their home in the last one month?  

32. In the last 12 months, have you worked with others in your village to do something for the community?

(a) Yes [ ]

(b) No [ ]

33. If YES, was your participation in these activities voluntary or required?

a) Voluntary [ ]

b) Required [ ]

34. How likely is it that people who do not participate in community work will be criticized or sanctioned?

a) Very likely [ ]
b) Somewhat likely [ ]
c) Neither likely nor unlikely [ ]
d) Somewhat unlikely [ ]
e) Very unlikely [ ]

35. In your view, what are the most important factors you think help people to live and work together as a community in this village?
   a) ……………………………………………………………………………
   b) ……………………………………………………………………………
   c) ……………………………………………………………………………

SECTION E: Levels of Settlement and Integration

36. Generally, how would you describe your level of settlement so far since you left the camp for the internally displaced people? Use a three point scale where 1 means fully settled, 2 not fully settled and 3 not settled at all.
   a) Fully settled [ ]
   b) Not fully settled [ ]
   c) Not settled [ ]

37. Talking about the premises that you are presently living in, is it:
   a) Owned by self [ ]
   b) Belongs to a relative [ ]
   c) Rented [ ]
   d) Squatter [ ]
38. If in 37 above is owned by self, how would you describe your house? Use the three point scale where 1 means permanent, 2 semi-permanent and 3 make shift.
   a) Permanent [ ]
   b) Semi-permanent [ ]
   c) Makeshift [ ]

39. What construction material is used for the majority of the exterior walls of the house or building?
   a) Blocks/Bricks/Stone/Concrete/Cement [ ]
   b) Wood/Timber [ ]
   c) Sticks/Straws [ ]
   d) Tent/Canvas/Polythene [ ]
   e) Other (specify) ________________________________

40. What is the construction material of the roof of your house/building?
   a) Iron sheets [ ]
   b) Straw or thatch [ ]
   c) Asbestos [ ]
   d) Other (Please specify) ________________________________

41. What is the construction material of most of the floor of your house?
   a). Concrete [ ]
   b). Tiles [ ]
   c). Wood [ ]
   d) Earth [ ]
   d) Other (Please specify) ________________________________
42. What type of sanitary services does this household use?
   a). Water Closet (WC)/Flush toilet [  ]
   b). Latrine [  ]
   c). Bush [  ]
   d) Other (*Please specify*)

43. Where do you get water for drinking and domestic use?
   a) River/Stream [  ]
   b) Well [  ]
   c) Piped water services [  ]
   d) Private Vendors [  ]
   e) Water Kiosks [  ]

44. To what extent have you recovered in the following livelihood activities? Use a four point scale where 1 means fully recovered and 4 not recovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Farming activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. Livestock keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Business activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Regular employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. To what extent are you involved in community activities?
   a) Fully involved [  ]
   b) Involved [  ]
   c) Rarely involved [  ]
d) Not involved at all [ ]

46. Are there community activities which you are not allowed to be involved?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No (i.e. can participate in all). [ ]

(If YES, proceed to question No. 47)

47. In which activities are you not allowed to participate?
   a) ……………………………………………………………………………
   b) ……………………………………………………………………………
   c) ……………………………………………………………………………

48. Why are you not allowed participating?
   (a) Poverty [ ]
   (b) Occupation [ ]
   (c) Lack of education [ ]
   (d) Gender [ ]
   e) Religion [ ]
   (f) Ethnicity [ ]
   (g) Other (Please specify)………………

49. In general, how safe from crime and violence do you feel when you are alone at home?
   (a) Very safe [ ]
   (b) Moderately safe [ ]
   (c) Neither safe nor unsafe [ ]
   (d) Moderately unsafe [ ]
   (e) Very unsafe [ ]
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50. How do you feel when walking around your village alone after dark?
   (a) Very safe [ ]
   (b) Moderately safe [ ]
   (c) Neither safe nor unsafe [ ]
   (d) Moderately unsafe [ ]
   (e) Very unsafe [ ]

51. Generally, do you feel that you fully belong to this village/community?
   (a) Yes [ ]
   (b) No [ ]

52. If NO, why?

......................................................................................................
......................................................................................................

52. What would you suggest to be done to make you fit as a full member of the community you live with?

......................................................................................................
......................................................................................................

Thank you for choosing to participate in this study.
Appendix II: Key Informant Interview Guide

Date of Interview ____________________

Key informant designation (Community leaders e.g. chief, Ward representative, Member of Parliament etc. Representative of government department, Officer from civil society e.g. NGO ___________________________________________________________
Organization/Department______________________________________________
Location______________________________________________________________
Sub-location___________________________________________________________
Village_______________________________________________________________

A. Groups and Social networks

1. I would like us to talk about the groups, organizations, social networks or associations found in this village. These could be formally organized groups of people who get together regularly to discuss issues. How does one become a member of these groups? (The criteria used for joining these groups will be probed).

2. How does your organization/department relate/interact with these groups?

3. What do you think are the main goals of these groups?

4. What are the membership characteristics of these groups? (Probe on whether members are of the same religion, gender, ethnic groups, income etc.)

5. Do these groups interact with other groups with similar goals in the village?

6. What about with those groups with different goals in and outside the village?

7. What about with other groups with similar goals outside the village?

8. What about with those groups with different goals in and outside the village?

9. Do they interact with people in position of authority? (E.g. political leaders, local government officials etc.)
10. Do they interact with non-governmental institutions that are outside the community?

**B. Impact of social capital on household welfare**

11. Do you think these groups are beneficial to the members’ households particularly those of the IDPs? *(Probe the kind of benefits members derive from these groups)*

12. Do the members of these groups help each other out? *(Probe how they are able to do that)*

13. What has been the contribution of these groups in the resettlement of the internally displaced people?

**C. Sustainability of social capital**

14. To what extent are the members of this community feel close to one another?

15. How is that closeness or lack of it manifested?

16. Do members of this village come out to work together to do something for the community?

17. Please tell me the factors that you think help people to live and work together as a community in this village.

**D. Levels of settlement and integration**

18. What do you think is the level of settlement for the IDPs (people who were displaced and have since moved out of the camps and returned to the villages) in this village?

19. How involved are the IDPs in community activities?

20. Are there community activities which they are not allowed to participate? If yes, Why?
21. Do you think the IDPs fully feel belonging to this village? What makes you think so?

22. Do you think people in this community can generally be trusted?

23. Generally, how safe is it walking around the village after dark?

Thank you for your participation
Appendix III: Interview Guide For Focus Group Discussion

Date of Interview ____________________

FGD Size ________

Location_______________

Village _________________

1. I would like to start by asking you some questions about this village/community and how you take part in the community activities.

Are there any social groups or informal organizations that people in this village/community belong to? Kindly name these groups.

2. Do you consider people belonging to these groups as active members or relatively inactive? What makes you think so?

3. Among these groups, which are the most important especially to people who experienced internal displacement but have since returned?

4. Do you think people belonging to these groups derive benefits from them? How have you benefitted from these groups?

5. Overall, how would describe the quality of these groups in terms of:

   a. Group participation, such as meetings and group activities
   b. Group leadership
   c. Group cohesion
   d. Diversity of group membership
   e. Relationship with local government and the broader community

6. Suppose someone in this village had something unfortunate happen to them, e.g. a sudden death. Who do you think they could turn for help in such a situation?
7. Do people in this village contribute time and money toward common development goals?

8. If a community project does not directly benefit your neighbor but has benefits for others in this village, do you think your neighbor would contribute time and money for this project?

9. Are the relationships among people in this village generally harmonious or disagreeable?

10. Generally, how safe is it walking around the village after dark?

11. Do you think any people within the community feel excluded from these groups? Who are they and do the groups have any efforts to incorporate them? (For example, if someone wants to join the group but they cannot afford the membership dues or contributions for group activities; do the groups offer any assistance?)

Thank you for your participation
Appendix IV: Interview Guide for Group Leaders

Date of Interview ____________________

Location__________________

Village_____________________

1. When and how was the group formed?
2. How many members does the group have?
3. What are the group’s main activities and projects?
4. How is the group leadership determined? Are they elected and for how long?
   What are the qualifications for the group’s leaders?
5. Can you tell us about the people involved in your group? How does one become a member? Why do you think people join? Do other people in the community or village get involved?
6. How often does the group meet?
7. What benefits do members derive from the group?
8. How would you characterize the quality of the following:
   a. Participation in group meetings
   b. Group activities
   c. Decision-making
   d. Diversity of people in the group, such as by age, gender, wealth, ethnicity,
9. How would you characterize your group’s relationship with village leaders, Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and County and national government offices? Do you feel that you receive adequate support and information from these partners?
10. Has the group received outside support? What type of support?
11. Do you think any people within the community feel excluded from this group?
   Who are they and does the group have any efforts to incorporate them? (For example, if someone wants to join the group but they cannot afford the membership dues or contributions for group activities, do you offer any assistance?)

12. What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of this group?

13. What would you do to make this group more effective?

14. What are the future priorities/goals for the group?

   Thank you for your participation.
## Appendix V: Observation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Parameters</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>YES if present (Tick in the box)</th>
<th>NO if absent (Tick in the box)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nature of houses/shelter</td>
<td>a) Permanent house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Semi-permanent house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Temporary house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type of construction material used for the majority of the exterior walls of the houses or buildings</td>
<td>a) Blocks/Bricks/Stone/Concrete/Cement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Wood/Timber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Sticks/Straws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Tent/Canvas/Polythene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The construction materials of the roofs of most the houses/buildings</td>
<td>a) Iron sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Straw or thatch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Asbestos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of sanitary facilities available</td>
<td>a) Water Closet (WC)/Flush toilet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Latrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Flying toilet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Source(s) of water for drinking and domestic use (If more than one tick all that is observed)</td>
<td>a) Rivers/Streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Well water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Piped water services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Private vendors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Water kiosks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land use activities</td>
<td>a) Crop farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Livestock keeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Mining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Quarrying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>