

SURVEY REPORT ON MARGINALISED AREAS/ COUNTIES IN KENYA



CRA Working Paper No. 2012/03



Commission
on Revenue
Allocation

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table of contents | I |
| List of tables | II |
| Figures | II |
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | III |
| Acknowledgement | IV |
| <hr/> | |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Literature review | 2 |
| 2.1. Cause of marginalisation and ways of identifying marginalised areas | 2 |
| 3. Methodology | 5 |
| 4. Results | 6 |
| 4.1. Individual questionnaire results | 6 |
| 4.2. Focus group discussion questionnaire results | 12 |
| 5. Discussion | 15 |
| 5.1. Individual questionnaire | 15 |
| 5.2. Focus group discussions | 16 |
| 6. Conclusions and policy implications | 18 |
| References | 19 |
| Appendices | 20 |



List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Participants familiar with the term marginalisation | 6 |
| Table 2: Proposed parameters for CRA to use to identify marginalised counties | 7 |
| Table 3: Other factors to be used by CRA to identify marginalised areas | 8 |
| Table 4: Most marginalised counties in Kenya | 10 |
| Table 5: Responses to the question on existence of marginalised areas in the respective counties | 11 |
| Table 6: Group proposals of criteria that CRA should use to identify marginalised counties | 12 |
| Table 7: Group proposals of the MOST marginalised counties | 14 |
| Table 8: County mentioned by at least 2% of the participants as marginalised | 15 |
| Table 9: Proposed factors by at least 2% of the focus groups | 16 |
| Table 10: Proposed factors to identify marginalised counties | 17 |
| Table 11: Summary of marginalised counties in both the individual and group questionnaires | 11 |

Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| ASAL | Arid and Semi-Arid Land |
| COTU | Central Organisation of Trade Unions |
| CRA | Commission on Revenue Allocation |
| FGD | focus group discussions |
| GIS | Geographic Information Systems |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| ICT | Information Communication Technology |
| KNUT | Kenya National Union of Teachers |
| LDLD | Liberian National Decentralisation and Local Development Program |
| MTEF | medium-term expenditure framework |
| NCKK | National Council of Churches of Kenya |
| NGOs | non-governmental organisations |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WEF | World Economic Forum |
| CONAPO | Consejo Nacional de Población (National Council of Population; Mexico) |



Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the Office of the President through the county commissioners, who spearheaded the mobilisation efforts during stakeholder consultations, thus making the county engagements a success. This work would not have been possible without the concerted effort of the chair of the Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), the vice chair, commissioners and the chief executive officer, all of whom organised and visited all 47 counties to carry out civic education and solicit public views on the Equalisation Fund. For the technical support that made the exercise a success much appreciation goes to the Research and Policy and County Fiscal Affairs department headed by Dr. Moses Sichei and Stephen Masha respectively, and the directors, including Dr. Dulacha Barako, James Katule, Joseph Kuria, George Muruli and Sheilla Yeke. The contributions of the various department officers, including Martha Maneno, are highly acknowledged. In addition, this work would not have been successful without the research team effort from Jennifer Mukhongo, Henry Mecha, Stephen Khadondi, Meimuna Muhamed, Mwendu Mwendwa and Stephen Orenge, who all worked tirelessly to coordinate the county engagements, analyse the data and write the report. Much gratitude is also extended to the entire CRA staff, which offered great support in various capacities and contributed to the success of the exercise. Above all, many thanks are due to the people of Kenya, who participated and represented their various counties during the county visits. Without their views this paper would not have been possible.

There are many other people and organisations that provided support, encouragement, and ideas during the consultations, and the collection and validation of information. It is not possible to thank them all by name, but the CRA is grateful to all members of the public, civil society organisations, private sector practitioners, academia and other organised groups who attended the CRA public hearings and meetings, submitted written comments, memoranda and recommendations and contributed invaluable insight to this report.

1. Introduction

Marginalisation is a consequence of a skewed process of the distribution of scarce resources; it has been interpreted as a process of social exclusion from the dominant socio-economic, cultural and political structure. The Constitution of Kenya 2010 defines marginalised communities as one or more of the following:

- a) A community that, because of its relatively small population or for any other reason, has been unable to fully participate in the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole.
- b) A traditional community that, out of a need or desire to preserve its unique culture and identity from assimilation, has remained outside the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole.
- c) An indigenous community that has retained and maintained a traditional lifestyle and livelihood based on a hunter or gatherer economy; or pastoral persons and communities, whether they are:
 - (i.) nomadic or
 - (ii.) a settled community that, because of its relative geographic isolation, has experienced only marginal participation in the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole.

Kenya is characterised by marginalisation and inequality, exacerbated by the high level standards of living and insecurity. The constitution addresses the issue on marginalisation through affirmative action programmes and policies that are designed to redress any disadvantage suffered by individuals or groups because of past discrimination.

Various methods have been suggested as to how to determine marginalised areas and communities. Suggested methods of measuring regional disparities have provoked much debate. Disparity is a multifaceted concept encompassing dimensions such as convergence, inequality and polarisation. In fact there are so many disparity indicators that, even when analysing a specific dimension, it is not an easy task to choose among them. This being the case, the best practice usually involves the use of different indicators to measure the same dimension: if all indicators point to the same direction one can be fairly sure that the results are robust.

The constitution states that public participation is desirable in any key decision making that touches on policy issues. Thus, to identify marginalised areas the CRA undertook a survey over two weeks in June 2012, to seek public opinion regarding the criteria to be used when identifying marginalised areas in Kenya. The survey was conducted in all 47 counties and views were collected from individuals and groups representing many sectors of society. The survey was intended to assess the level of understanding of the term marginalisation as far as it relates to Kenya, and the criteria that citizens would prefer to use to identify marginalised counties. The respondents proposed specific parameters to be used in the identification process and named some of the counties that they considered to be marginalised. In each of the 47 counties, various areas within the counties were also mentioned as marginalised.



2. Literature Review

2.1. Cause of marginalisation and how to identify marginalised areas

Marginalisation is caused by various factors that can be both common to, and unique from, one place to another. The increasing importance of addressing the issue means that a number of countries have carried out studies to identify marginalised areas using various criteria.

- In Liberia marginalisation emanated from the exclusion of the indigenous population from political governance institutions, with little or no access to key economic assets. The centralisation of political power confined the decision-making processes to the elite and led to corruption. Marginalisation was then perpetuated by the urban bias of policies of successive administrations, which concentrated infrastructure and basic services in Monrovia and other main urban centres and excluded the rural hinterlands (UNDP, 2007). Marginalisation was also fostered by the economic and social challenges implicit in high levels of absolute and relative poverty, in both rural and urban sectors. These included food insecurity, weak infrastructure, meagre social services and poor governance.
- Australia identified marginalised areas as those that are distinct from the other parts of the state, in that they are not integrated socially and economically into broader community and economic networks and systems. In other words, these areas stand out as deviating from the norm. The areas identified as marginalised are characterised by economic deprivation and dependence, social disconnectedness and deviance, political inaction and apathy. The result is the necessity for government intervention programmes to ensure that human potential can be fulfilled. Factors associated with social exclusion that were used to identify marginalised areas included: unemployment, health and the crime rate (Cameron & Gibson, 2005).
- In China regional disparities were determined using five disparity measurements: population weighted co-efficiency, population weighted Theil index, the Gini Index, population weighted mean logarithmic deviation and the weighted Atkinson index (Hoshino, 2011).

- Marginalised areas in Mexico were identified using census and survey data. Their locations were needed to facilitate fund allocation and programmes targeted at poverty alleviation. The official Mexican agency for geographic and demographic data, the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI), along with the CONAPO Consejo Nacional de Población (National Council of Population), had various systems for ranking the levels of well being and marginalisation for states and municipalities. The state of Nuevo Leon was consistently ranked high in well-being indices in comparison to the rest of the country. An index of marginalisation study carried out in 1995 took into account four dimensions of marginalisation: education, housing, population dispersion, and income (Dana, 2008). Nuevo Leon was placed in the lowest bracket of marginalisation, along with three other states and the Federal District (Mexico is composed of 31 states and 1 Federal District). The study used two main types of data: spatial data in the form of GIS shape files, and demographic/census data in the form of excel files. Thresholds for variables were determined with each variable given a unique threshold in order to include the top 10% most marginalised.
- In the Horn of Africa and East Africa, pastoralists are the most politically marginalised group. Morton (2005) argues that the major issues in pastoral development are related to policy and governance. These are: conflicts and insecurity, livestock marketing, land rights, inadequate provision of services and infrastructure, drought and dependence on food aid. Therefore the political marginalisation of pastoralists is understood to be the result of an imbalanced power relation between the state and pastoral civil society. Other factors are the long-standing governance failures, non-responsive and unaccountable institutions, and politicians and policy-makers lacking the will and incentive to include pastoralists' interests in national policy formulation (Pavanello, 2009).

The African Forum report on Identifying and Assisting the Most Marginalised Population in Sub-Saharan Africa identified marginalised groups and minorities in Africa using the following methodologies:

- **Desk study** This was used to understand the meaning and context of marginalisation. The study involved books, journals, newspaper cuttings, government publications and research reports from local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), published and unpublished works on minority studies and consultations with the marginalised communities. Data sources included libraries, research institutions and other organisations in the regions under study.
- **Multiple-deprivation** Deprivation leads to marginalisation and is associated with poverty; hence the conclusion that marginalisation can be measured by the population's degree of deprivation. This study proposed adopting multiple deprivations indicators to determine where, why and how marginalisation takes place, and proposed mitigation approaches to marginalisation. It characterised deprivation as



a lack of proper and sustainable income sources and a lack of a reasonable livelihood. In addition, deprivation was characterised by little or no access to proper health care and education, and the quality of the environment in which people had to live. The indicators for multi-deprivation are similar to those of poverty and might provide sufficient latitude to identify and assist marginalised populations. Deprivation differs in degree and poses diverse challenges; it thus requires assorted solutions.

- **Marginalisation indices** There is quite a portfolio of current indices available, including the Mo Ibrahim Governance Indices for Africa, and indices developed and maintained by the OECD, the UNDP, the World Bank, the World Economic Forum (WEF) and others. These cover a variety of issues, such as the economic viability and sustainability of the economies of nations, political, economic and social governance of nations, the multiple deprivations of nations, provinces and local communities and the human development index (HDI).

Marginalisation has persisted in some regions of Kenya since independence due to the underlying resource allocation policy embedded in Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965. The allocation policy was based on a strategy of channelling resources to areas of high returns in order to attain rapid economic growth. Although this was with the view of promoting an equitable distribution of resources throughout the country, it actually did the opposite and caused marginalisation.

In 1989 the University of Nairobi admissions board formed a sub-committee on disadvantaged districts. The sub-committee developed criteria to identify disadvantaged districts based on the opportunity index, which was derived from population density, primary and secondary schools enrolment per capita, wage earners per capita and earnings per capita. They identified Marsabit, Turkana, Wajir, Mandera, Garissa, Tana River, Samburu, Narok, West Pokot, Isiolo, Lamu, Kajiado, Kitui, Kilifi, Kwale, Laikipia, Baringo, Taita Taveta, and Elgeyo Marakwet as disadvantaged districts.

In 2001 the Joint Admissions Board also developed an affirmative action admissions policy to address gender disparity in students from disadvantaged districts. In their policy they used the poverty index, student/teacher ratio, the primary and secondary schools dropout rate, and the sex ratio of primary and secondary school enrolment as criteria to identify disadvantaged districts. They classified Tana River, Lamu, Isiolo, Turkana Samburu, Marsabit, West Pokot, Kajiado, Narok, Baringo, Keiyo-Marakwet, Garissa, Wajir and Mandera as disadvantaged districts.

In general, marginalised areas are usually cut off from the national axis of growth due to distance and inaccessibility. They have poor road networks and do not have access to sufficient electricity for household or industrial usage. The availability of basic services, quality water, sanitation and security, which are core to economic growth, is limited in these areas. These areas therefore lack the endowment and significance to attract potential investors and tourists.

3. Methodology

A national survey to identify marginalised areas/counties was carried out in June 2012 in all 47 counties. It involved 3,707 representative participants drawn from all counties and various sectors, responding to both individual and group questionnaires. The individual questionnaire was completed by each participant without consultation with other respondents. The participants were then randomly put into groups for focus group discussions (FGD), after which they completed the group questionnaires. The group discussions were moderated by the group chair and a group secretary completed the questionnaire following the group consensus. In cases where no consensus was reached the groups went for a simple majority. The questions on marginalisation were questions 13 to 18 for the individual questionnaire (Appendix 1) and questions (2) v, vi and vii for the group questionnaire (Appendix 2).



4. Results

4.1. Individual questionnaire results

During the individual questionnaire survey, participants were asked about marginalisation. The responses were as discussed below.

The participants were asked whether were familiar with the term marginalisation. Table 1 gives an indication of how many participants understood the term marginalisation as far as it relates to Kenya

Table 1: Participants familiar with the term marginalisation

| Responses | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------|------------|
| Yes | 3,314 | 89.4 |
| No | 226 | 6.10 |
| Not indicated | 165 | 4.45 |
| Don't know | 2 | 0.05 |
| Total | 3,707 | 100 |

The majority of the participants were familiar with the term marginalisation as depicted by a majority of 89.4% whose response was YES (Table 1).

There was a 93.02% probability that a respondent would say YES, 5.43% NO and 1.53% that the answer to the question would be left blank. The choice of responses was significantly influenced by the level of education of the respondents.

Table 2 shows frequency of responses for the parameters proposed by the participants to be used to identify marginalised counties

Table 2 : Proposed parameters for CRA to use to identify marginalised counties

| Parameters | Frequency of responses | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Not indicated | 7,183 | 38.75% |
| Road infrastructure | 2,579 | 13.91% |
| Access to health facilities | 2,438 | 13.15% |
| Access to water | 2,345 | 12.65% |
| Historical injustices | 2,217 | 11.96% |
| Access to electricity | 1,772 | 9.56% |
| Total | 18,535 | 100.00% |

A majority of the participants did not respond to the question as depicted by almost 39% being blank. The distribution of the percentage frequencies for each parameter are as shown below.

Among all the above five parameters, there was a small difference in the number of respondents who proposed road infrastructure and access to health facilities as parameters to be used in determining marginalised areas. The choice for infrastructure was influenced by the level of education. As you move from one education level to a higher education level, the probability of a person leaving the question blank will decrease by 1.25%. The choice of access to health facilities was influenced by the age of respondents.



Table 3 shows the individual responses on other factors to be considered in the identification of marginalised areas.

Table 3 : Other factors to be used by CRA to identify marginalised areas

| Parameter | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Level of education | 1,783 | 28.41 |
| Road infrastructure | 453 | 7.22 |
| Unemployment level | 363 | 5.78 |
| Poverty | 309 | 4.92 |
| Food insecurity | 281 | 4.48 |
| Health facilities | 273 | 4.35 |
| Insecurity | 242 | 3.86 |
| Historical injustices | 210 | 3.35 |
| Level of economic activities | 195 | 3.11 |
| Access to water | 173 | 2.76 |
| Survey | 168 | 2.68 |
| Climatic conditions | 162 | 2.58 |
| Land aridity | 152 | 2.42 |
| Access to housing | 149 | 2.37 |
| Population | 139 | 2.21 |
| Natural resources | 137 | 2.18 |
| Culture/diversity | 119 | 1.90 |
| Land resources | 112 | 1.78 |
| Landlessness | 97 | 1.55 |
| ICT infrastructure | 96 | 1.53 |
| Industries | 81 | 1.29 |
| Land terrain | 77 | 1.23 |
| Vulnerable groups | 64 | 1.02 |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Gender disparity | 59 | 0.94 |
| Access to electricity | 59 | 0.94 |
| Generation gaps | 47 | 0.75 |
| Remoteness | 45 | 0.72 |
| Access to government funds | 36 | 0.57 |
| Business opportunities | 33 | 0.53 |
| Total county revenue | 32 | 0.51 |
| Human resource development | 29 | 0.46 |
| Access to financial services | 20 | 0.32 |
| Access to justice | 20 | 0.32 |
| Natural disaster | 18 | 0.29 |
| Slums | 17 | 0.27 |
| Number of constituencies | 8 | 0.13 |
| Sanitation | 6 | 0.10 |
| Level of corruption | 6 | 0.10 |
| Hardship areas | 4 | 0.06 |
| Drug abuse | 2 | 0.03 |
| Total | 6,276 | 100 |



Table 4 shows the most marginalised counties as proposed by individual participants.

Table 4 : Most marginalised counties in Kenya

| County | F | P (%) | County | F | P (%) |
|-----------------|-------|-------|------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Turkana | 1,689 | 21.87 | Kakamega | 44 | 0.57 |
| Marsabit | 681 | 8.82 | Makueni | 40 | 0.52 |
| Mandera | 636 | 8.23 | Bungoma | 39 | 0.5 |
| Lamu | 621 | 8.04 | Migori | 36 | 0.47 |
| Wajir | 594 | 7.69 | Siaya | 35 | 0.45 |
| Samburu | 372 | 4.82 | Homa Bay | 33 | 0.43 |
| Isiolo | 370 | 4.79 | Kisumu | 29 | 0.38 |
| Tana River | 324 | 4.19 | Trans Nzoia | 28 | 0.36 |
| West Pokot | 307 | 3.97 | Kisii | 24 | 0.31 |
| Garissa | 282 | 3.65 | Nyandarua | 21 | 0.27 |
| Kilifi | 205 | 2.65 | Nyeri | 21 | 0.27 |
| Kwale | 171 | 2.21 | Vihiga | 21 | 0.27 |
| Kitui | 142 | 1.84 | Nyamira | 21 | 0.27 |
| Taita/Taveta | 103 | 1.33 | Murang'a | 20 | 0.26 |
| Baringo | 94 | 1.22 | Bomet | 20 | 0.26 |
| Narok | 81 | 1.05 | Nakuru | 19 | 0.25 |
| Nairobi City | 80 | 1.04 | Kiambu | 16 | 0.21 |
| Mombasa | 79 | 1.02 | Embu | 15 | 0.19 |
| Elgeyo/Marakwet | 75 | 0.97 | Nandi | 12 | 0.16 |
| Kajiado | 70 | 0.91 | Uasin Gishu | 11 | 0.14 |
| Laikipia | 63 | 0.82 | Kericho | 9 | 0.12 |
| Tharaka-Nithi | 55 | 0.71 | Meru | 7 | 0.09 |
| Machakos | 53 | 0.69 | Kirinyaga | 4 | 0.05 |
| Busia | 52 | 0.67 | Total Responses | 7,724 | 100 |

KEY

F - Frequency

P - Percentage

The participants were asked if there are any marginalised areas in their own county. Table 5 shows the responses.

Table 5: Responses to the question on existence of marginalised areas in the respective counties

| Responses | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Yes | 2,783 | 75.07 |
| No | 419 | 11.30 |
| Not indicated | 302 | 8.15 |
| Don't know | 203 | 5.48 |
| Total | 3,707 | 100.00 |

A majority of 75.07% indicated that there were marginalised areas in their respective counties, while 11.3% reported the absence of marginalised areas in their counties, 5.48% did not know, while 8.15% did not respond to the question (Table 5).



4.2. Focus group discussion questionnaire results

The group questionnaires were administered during the focus group discussions (FGD). Table 6 shows the group proposals on the criteria to be used to identify marginalised areas.

Table 6: Group proposals of criteria that CRA should use to identify marginalised counties

| Factors to be used | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Infrastructure | 142 | 14.4 |
| Access to education/school enrolment | 116 | 11.8 |
| Access to water | 90 | 9.2 |
| Access to health services | 90 | 9.2 |
| Historical injustices/unfair distribution of resources | 69 | 7.0 |
| Literacy levels | 63 | 6.4 |
| Roads/transport | 59 | 6.0 |
| Security/insecurity | 57 | 5.8 |
| Access to electricity | 40 | 4.1 |
| Poverty levels | 38 | 3.9 |
| Erratic/diverse weather conditions/ASAL areas | 32 | 3.3 |
| Access to food/food security | 21 | 2.1 |
| Land productivity/land terrain/topography/agriculture | 19 | 1.9 |
| Employment in public service/employment | 16 | 1.6 |
| Information/communication/ICT | 12 | 1.2 |
| Industries/ industrialisation/economic activities | 11 | 1.1 |
| Natural resources/under exploitation of natural resources | 11 | 1.1 |
| Carry out a survey/collection of data/visit marginalised areas/mapping | 8 | 0.8 |

| | | |
|---|------------|--------------|
| Squatters/land ownership/landlessness | 8 | 0.8 |
| Human development index | 8 | 0.8 |
| Natural disasters/areas affected by floods | 7 | 0.7 |
| Basic housing | 6 | 0.6 |
| Underdevelopment | 6 | 0.6 |
| Women representation/ gender | 6 | 0.6 |
| Income/ per capita | 6 | 0.6 |
| Political injustices/political affiliations/discrimination against minority | 5 | 0.5 |
| Cultural beliefs/cultural values | 5 | 0.5 |
| Remoteness/inaccessibility/distance/isolated/ far off | 4 | 0.4 |
| Sanitation | 4 | 0.4 |
| County productivity | 3 | 0.3 |
| Disabled people/physically challenged persons | 3 | 0.3 |
| Mortality rate | 3 | 0.3 |
| Environmental factors | 2 | 0.2 |
| Slum dwellers | 2 | 0.2 |
| Age distribution of the population/population of the tribe | 2 | 0.2 |
| Basic needs | 2 | 0.2 |
| Conflict persistence | 1 | 0.1 |
| Dependency ration | 1 | 0.1 |
| Skilled workforce/capability and strengths | 1 | 0.1 |
| Wildlife menace | 1 | 0.1 |
| Boy child | 1 | 0.1 |
| Drug abuse | 1 | 0.1 |
| Prevalence of diseases | 1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 983 | 100.0 |



Through the focus groups discussions the following counties were proposed as the most marginalised (Table 7).

Table 7 : Group proposals of the MOST marginalised counties

| County Name | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Turkana | 176 | 27.72 |
| Marsabit | 68 | 10.71 |
| Wajir | 60 | 9.45 |
| Lamu | 56 | 9.13 |
| Mandera | 53 | 8.35 |
| Tana River | 35 | 5.51 |
| West Pokot | 33 | 5.20 |
| Samburu | 25 | 3.94 |
| Kilifi | 16 | 2.52 |
| Isiolo | 14 | 2.20 |
| Garissa | 11 | 1.73 |
| Kwale | 9 | 1.42 |
| Kitui | 9 | 1.42 |
| Taita Taveta | 9 | 1.42 |
| Baringo | 6 | 0.94 |
| Trans Nzoia | 5 | 0.79 |
| Tharaka Nithi | 5 | 0.79 |
| Busia | 4 | 0.63 |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | 4 | 0.63 |
| Laikipia | 4 | 0.63 |
| Narok | 4 | 0.63 |
| Migori | 3 | 0.47 |
| Machakos | 3 | 0.47 |
| Kajiado | 3 | 0.47 |
| Makueni | 3 | 0.47 |
| Kakamega | 2 | 0.31 |
| Bungoma | 2 | 0.31 |
| Nyandarua | 2 | 0.31 |
| Siaya | 2 | 0.31 |
| Nyeri | 2 | 0.31 |
| Nandi | 1 | 0.16 |
| Homa bay | 1 | 0.16 |
| Kisumu | 1 | 0.16 |
| Kisii | 1 | 0.16 |
| Mombasa | 1 | 0.16 |
| Total | 633 | 100 |

5. Discussion

5.1. Individual questionnaire

Out of the 3,707 participants interviewed on marginalisation, 89% were familiar with the term marginalisation, whereas 6% were not familiar with the terminology. The high percentage of participant familiarity with the term is an indication that the subject was well understood to the majority and that the information they gave was reliable.

Among the parameters proposed by CRA for the identification of marginalised areas, the participants selected, in order of importance, the following: road infrastructure, access to health facilities, access to water, historical injustices and access to electricity.

The participants proposed, in total, 40 factors to be considered in the identification of marginalised areas. Of these, 16 factors were proposed by at least 2% of the participants as listed below:

Proposed factors

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Level of education | 7. Insecurity | 13. Land aridity |
| 2. Road infrastructure | 8. Historical injustices | 14. Access to housing |
| 3. Unemployment level | 9. Natural resources | 15. Population |
| 4. Poverty | 10. Access to water | 16. Level of economic activities |
| 5. Food insecurity | 11. Survey | |
| 6. Health facilities | 12. Climatic conditions | |

Asked, in their view, which was the most marginalised county, a few from each county felt that their own county was marginalised. However, Turkana was mentioned by the majority of the respondents from each county as the most marginalised. Alongside Turkana the following counties were also mentioned by at least 2% of the participants as the most marginalised counties in Kenya (Table 8).

Table 8: County mentioned by at least 2% of the participants as marginalised

| | | | | |
|-------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1. Turkana | 4. Mandera | 7. Samburu | 10. Garissa | 13. Kitui |
| 2. Marsabit | 5. Wajir | 8. Tana river | 11. Kilifi | 14. Baringo |
| 3. Lamu | 6. Isiolo | 9. West Pokot | 12. Kwale | 15. Taita Taveta |



5.2. Focus group discussions

The focus group discussions proposed 45 factors to be used as criteria by the CRA to identify marginalised areas in Kenya. Out of the 220 FGDs at least 2% mentioned the following factors (Table 9).

Table 9: Proposed factors by at least 2% of the focus groups

Factors

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Access to education /school enrolment and retention/literacy |
| 2. | Infrastructure |
| 3. | Roads/transport |
| 4. | Access to water |
| 5. | Access to health services |
| 6. | Historical injustices/unfair distribution of resources |
| 7. | Security/insecurity |
| 8. | Poverty levels |
| 9. | Access to electricity |
| 10. | Erratic weather conditions/disaster/floods/drought/ASAL |
| 11. | Employment in public service/employment/ representation in central government/ human resource/representation in state organs |
| 12. | Land productivity (agriculture/fisheries)/ land terrain/ topography |
| 13. | Access to food/food security |

The focus groups discussed and listed the most marginalised counties in Kenya, coming up with 35 counties as marginalised. As mentioned earlier, Turkana lead the list of the most marginalised counties.

The following counties were mentioned by at least 1% of the total number of groups as the most marginalised in Kenya:

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 1. Turkana | 5. Mandera | 8. Samburu | 11. Kwale |
| 2. Marsabit | 6. Tana River | 9. Kilifi | 12. Garissa |
| 3. Wajir | 7. West Pokot | 10. Isiolo | 13. Kitui |
| 4. Lamu | | | |

The summary of factors identified by both individuals and focus groups to be used in identifying marginalised counties is shown in table 10.

Table 10 : Proposed factors to identify marginalised counties

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Access to education school enrolment and retention/literacy |
| 2. | Infrastructure |
| 3. | Roads/transport |
| 4. | Access to water |
| 5. | Access to health services |
| 6. | Historical injustices /unfair distribution of resources |
| 7. | Security/insecurity |
| 8. | Poverty levels |
| 9. | Access to electricity |
| 10. | Erratic weather conditions/disaster/floods/drought/ASAL |
| 11. | Employment in public service/employment/representation in central government/human resource/representation in state organs |
| 12. | Land productivity (agriculture/fisheries)/land terrain/ topography |
| 13. | Access to food/food security |

Table 11 shows a summary of counties ranked as marginalised resulting from both the individual and group questionnaire, using a cut off average mean of 2.13 per cent.

Table 11: Summary of marginalised counties in both the individual and group questionnaires

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1. Turkana | 5. Mandera | 9. Isiolo |
| 2. Marsabit | 6. Tana River | 10. Garissa |
| 3. Wajir | 7. West Pokot | 11. Kilifi |
| 4. Lamu | 8. Samburu | |



6. Conclusions and policy implications

1. The evidence gathered from the county public consultative forums indicate that there are pockets of marginalised areas in all the 47 counties. The study identified a high level of marginalisation in some areas, communities and groups in Kenya, with a high prevalence in the arid and semi-arid regions.
2. The findings indicate that Turkana, Marsabit, Mandera, Lamu, Wajir, Isiolo, Samburu, Tana River, West Pokot and Garissa are the most marginalised counties in Kenya. In each of the 47 counties there is at least one marginalised area, community or group.
3. Additionally, the results indicate that the level of education, infrastructure, poverty index, food insecurity, health facilities, access to water and historical injustices should be used as criteria to identify the most marginalised areas.

References

Cameron & Gibson (2005). *Representing Marginalisation: Finding New Avenues for Economic and Social Intervention*. <http://www.griffith.edu.au/>

Dana S. 2008. Locating the Marginalised in Mexican cities. A spatial Model for Monterrey, Nuevo Leon.

Government of Kenya (2010) Constitution of Kenya 2010. Government Printers, Haile Selassie Avenue, Nairobi, Kenya.

Government of Kenya, (1965). *Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 – African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya*.

Hoshino M. (2011). *Measurement of GDP per capita and regional disparities in China 1979-2009*. Research Institute for Economics and Business Administration Kobe University, Japan.

Morton J. (2005) *Legislators and Livestock: A comparative Analysis of Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda*. Final Report for the NRI/PENHA Research Project on Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups. DFID, UK.

Pavanello S. (2009). *Pastoralists' Vulnerability in the Horn of Africa: Exploring Political Marginalisation, Donors' Policies, and Cross-Border Issues*. ODI. UK.

Report on the Implementation of Devolved Government in Kenya 2010.

University of Nairobi (1989) Report of the Sub-Committee of the Admission board of the University of Nairobi on disadvantaged districts.

UNDP (2007) Liberia Decentralisation and Local Development Program (LDLD).



Appendix 1: Individual Questionnaire

SECTION 1: SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Please respond to the following questions as provide below,

1. **Home County:** _____ **County of residence:** _____

2. **Constituency** _____

3. **Which interest group do you represent?** _____

4. Gender

Male Female

5. Age (Years):

18 and Below 40 to 59

19 to 39 Above 60

6. Marital Status:

Married Divorced/Separated

Single Other

Widow/Widower

7. Education Level:

Primary College/University

Secondary Other

8. Occupation:

9. How much is your monthly expenditure?

Under Kshs.24,670 Kshs.40, 001 to Ksh. 120,000 per month

Kshs.24, 670 to Kshs.40, 000 per month More than Kshs.120, 000 per month

SECTION 2: VIEWS ABOUT THE CRA'S PROPOSED REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA

10. Do you agree with the use of (POPULATION, POVERTY, LAND AREA, BASIC EQUAL SHARE and FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY) in the CRA's proposed revenue allocation formula?

Yes No Don't Know

11. If your answer in (10) is No, which parameter don't you agree with and why?

| | | |
|--|--------|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population | Reason | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Area | Reason | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poverty | Reason | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Equal Share | Reason | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Responsibility | Reason | |

12. CRA has proposed weights for the 5 parameters listed in the table below. If you do not agree with the weights, make suggestions. You may also suggest other parameters and corresponding weights to be considered.

| CRA Parameters | Weight | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | CRA proposal | Your Suggestion (tick only one box for each parameter) | |
| 1 Population | 60% | <input type="checkbox"/> Under 30% <input type="checkbox"/> 30-45% <input type="checkbox"/> 46-50% <input type="checkbox"/> 51-60% | <input type="checkbox"/> 61-65% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 65% |
| 2 Basic Equal Share | 20% | <input type="checkbox"/> Under 10% <input type="checkbox"/> 10-20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21-30% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30% | |
| 3 Poverty | 12% | <input type="checkbox"/> Under 5% <input type="checkbox"/> 5-10% <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15% <input type="checkbox"/> 16-25% | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 25% |
| 4 Land Area | 6% | <input type="checkbox"/> Under 5% <input type="checkbox"/> 5-10% <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15% <input type="checkbox"/> 21-30% | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30% |
| 5 Fiscal Responsibility | 2% | <input type="checkbox"/> Under 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2-5% <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10% <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15% | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 15% |
| Other Parameters (If Any) | | | |
| | | | |
| Total | 100% | | |

SECTION 3: MARGINALISATION POLICY

13. Are you familiar with the term 'marginalisation' in as far as it relates to Kenya?

Yes

No

14. In your view, which of the following parameters should CRA use to identify marginalised areas? (select all that apply)

Access to water

Access to electricity

Road infrastructure

Historical injustices

Access to health facilities

15. What other factors do you think should be used by CRA to identify marginalised areas?

i) _____

ii) _____

iii) _____

16. Based on the criteria set out above, which THREE counties do you think are MOST marginalised? (see county listing on CRA banners)

i) _____

ii) _____

iii) _____

17. Do you have any 'marginalised' areas in your county?

Yes

No

Don't know

If yes, name three.

i) _____

ii) _____

iii) _____

18. Are there any major under or unexploited resources in your county?

Yes

No

Don't know

If yes, name three.

i) _____

ii) _____

iii) _____

Appendix 2: Group Questionnaire

GUIDELINES FOR BREAK AWAY SESSIONS FOR THE FACILITATORS

1. Introduction

This break away session is a form of a focus group discussion, which is a standard exploratory research tool. The groups are made up of leaders of organised groups listed in the appendix of this document. The broad objective of this session is to provide the group with opportunity to brainstorm and come up with views and recommendations on:

- (i) Parameters and weights used in the proposed county revenue allocation formula; and,
- (ii) Criteria for identifying marginalised areas that will be used in allocating the Equalisation Fund.

The discussion is guided by a **group leader** and a **secretary/rapporteur** both of whom are chosen by the group members. The role of the group leader is to moderate the discussions and particularly to; (i) ensure that the group focuses on key thematic areas and deals with the critical issues identified by CRA, and (ii) help the group have a natural and free discussion in which each group member is given an opportunity to contribute. The secretary/rapporteur will take notes to be presented in the main plenary session.

Ideally, the group should strive to have a consensus on a particular issue. If consensus is not achieved, at least majority view should be recorded.

2. Key Issues to be Covered in the Breakaway Session

- i. Do you agree with the USE of (Population, Poverty, Land Area, Basic Equal Share and Fiscal Responsibility) as a parameter in the revenue allocation formula? Discuss each factor at a time.

| Parameter | Outcome | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No |
| 1 Population | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 Poverty | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 Land Area | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 Basic Equal Share | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 Fiscal Responsibility | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ii. If your answer is NO for any factor discuss the REASONS for your answer

| Parameter | Reasons for choosing NO |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Population | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| 2 Poverty | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| 3 Land Area | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| 4 Basic Equal Share | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| 5 Fiscal Responsibility | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |

iii. In the proposed formula by CRA, land area is bounded at a minimum of 1% and a maximum of 10%. Do you agree with **BINDING** of land area? (Yes or No). If your answer is **NO**, give reasons

- a)
- b)
- c)

iv. If you as a group can agree with WEIGHTS to be attached to (Population, Poverty, Land Area, Basic Equal Share and Fiscal Responsibility) parameters in the revenue allocation formula, please give them below:

| CRA Parameters | | Weight | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | CRA proposal | Your Suggestion |
| 1 | Population | 60% | |
| 2 | Basic Equal Share | 20% | |
| 3 | Poverty | 12% | |
| 4 | Land Area | 6% | |
| 5 | Fiscal Responsibility | 2% | |
| Other Parameters(Optional) | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Total | 100% | 100% |

v. As a group, can you propose **CRITERIA** that CRA should use in identifying marginalised areas in Kenya

.....

.....

.....

vi. List three of what the group considers to be the **MOST** marginalised counties in Kenya:

1)

2)

3)

vii. Are there any marginalised areas in your county?

Yes No Don't Know

If yes, please name them:

1)

2)

3)

3. Facilitating the Session

- Receive and welcome your participants to the group.
- Introduce yourself and the co-facilitator in the CRA team.
- Let the meeting begin with one of the participants offering a prayer (Optional). Ensure that there is a balance in terms of religion (Christianity, and Islam).
- Ask for participants to introduce themselves so as to create some familiarity.
- Go through the agenda of the meeting with the participants in terms of:
 - i The **choice** of parameters and **weights** in the proposed revenue allocation formula
 - ii **Criteria** for identifying marginalised areas
- Explain the purpose of the focus group discussion. Assure participants that their contribution is valued and important. Remind people that you want to hear their opinions and that you are not looking for 'right' answers to questions. The focus group is not a test.
- Facilitate the group to choose the chairman and the secretary/rapporteur of the group.
- Together with the participants set the ground rules. It is critical that all members participate as much as possible, yet the session should move along while generating useful information. Some of the key ground rules are:
 - a) Keep **focused**
 - b) Maintain **momentum** and control **time**
 - c) **Get closure** on questions
- Explain how the discussion will be recorded, e.g. notes, tape, video. Check that everybody feels comfortable with this.
- Close the session and remind the rapporteur about his/her duty to report outcomes

List of Interest Groups (Tick/note those represented and their numbers)

| No | Interest Group | Catchment |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Faith-based Organisations | NCCCK, Catholic & Council of Muslims |
| 2 | Youth Leaders | Yes Youth Can (USAID) |
| 3 | Government Officials | MTEF Sector representation |
| 4 | Civic Leaders | Mayors & Chair persons of Local Authorities |
| 5 | Political Parties | All parties with county presence/offices |
| 6 | Parliamentarians (if any) | |
| 7 | Women Leaders | Maendeleo & National Council of Women |
| 8 | Provincial Administration | |
| 9 | Professional Forums | County/umbrella professional forum |
| 10 | Trade Unions | COTU & KNUT |
| 11 | Teachers | Head Teachers' Association |
| 12 | Chamber of Commerce | |
| 13 | Disabled Persons | |
| 14 | NGOs | Resident NGOs only |
| 15 | Marginalised/Minority Groups | |
| 16 | Media | |
| 17 | Academia & Retired officers | |
| 18 | Private Sector | |
| 19 | Financial Institutions | |
| 20 | Council of Elders | |

DO NOT allow any one group to dominate discussion

Appendix 3: CRA County visit teams

| Team No. | Team members | Counties visited | |
|----------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Raphael Munavu 2. Stephen Khadondi 3. Abubakar Ali Boru 4. Irine Mwendwa | Samburu Laikipia Nyeri Kirinyaga | Narok Wajir Nyandarua |
| 2 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Rose Osoro 2. Dr. Moses Sichei 3. Steven Orengo 4. Rose Kazungu | Tana River Lamu Kilifi Mombasa | Kwale Taita Taveta Marsabit |
| 3 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. George Ooko 2. Stephen Masha 3. Ruth Kendagor 4. Evelyne Ndege | Garissa Kitui Makueni Machakos | Kajiado Isiolo Meru |
| 4 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Wafula Masai 2. Martha Maneno 3. Jeff Amimo 4. Wilson Mwangi Macharia | Homa Bay Migori Kisii Nyamira | Bomet Kiambu Muranga |
| 5 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comm. Amina Mohammed 2. James Katule 3. Mwendu Mwendwa 4. Ouma Steven Ochieng | Busia Siaya Kisumu Kericho | Nakuru Turkana |
| 6 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dr. Dulacha Barako 2. Joseph Kuria 3. Jennifer Nafula 4. Stanley Mutiso Mutuku 5. Alice Atogo | Uasin Gishu Bungoma Kakamega Vihiga Nandi | Tharaka Nithi Embu |
| 7 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Joseph Kimura 2. George Muruli 3. Henry Mecha 4. Susan C. Saina | Trans-nzoia West Pokot Baringo Elgeyo Marakwet Mandera | |



**Commission
on Revenue
Allocation**

Physical Address 14 Riverside Drive, Grosvenor Block, 2nd Floor.
P.O.Box 1310-00200, Nairobi

Landline +254-20-4298000

Mobile 0708-752 539 / 0731-776 666

Fax +254-20-4298251

Email info@crakenya.org

Website www.crakenya.org

Facebook [crakenya](https://www.facebook.com/crakenya)

Twitter [#crakenya](https://twitter.com/crakenya)

