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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is part of the research project ‘A Comparative Analysis of the Documentation of Torture and Ill-Treatment in Low-Income Countries’ that investigates the practices of the documentation of torture and ill-treatment in the capital cities of Kenya, Bangladesh, and Nepal.

The research project started in May 2014 with a mapping of the documenting organisations and key individuals in Nairobi, Dhaka, and Kathmandu. In 2015, the research project moved into its second phase and to a focus on the victims and witnesses of torture and ill-treatment, hence the main method used was a victimization survey. The research project is currently in its last phase, which centres on the development and dissemination of research outputs before the project comes to an end in October 2016.

The starting point for the research was that poverty and structural inequalities make marginal populations vulnerable to state violence. In the urban context, the poor often suffer high levels of violence perpetrated by law enforcement agents, yet they have limited ability to seek redress through reporting to NGOs, police or other public officials. The latter is party due to the fact that NGO documentation of torture and ill-treatment focuses mostly on places of detention – not the streets, market places, or informal settlements. Our broader research has concluded that in all three research sites (Kenya, Bangladesh and Nepal), torture and ill-treatment against the urban poor is under-perceived.¹

The mapping of the organisations involved in documenting torture and ill-treatment in Nairobi showed that there are a number of skilled NGOs that offer legal aid – a few offer psychological and medical rehabilitation – to victims and witnesses of torture and ill-treatment. The organisations operate with a broad notion of ‘violence’ rather than a UN conventional approach to ‘torture and ill-treatment’ and so the research project shifted to a focus on violence. These civil society actors operate from their offices situated in middle-class areas such as Nairobi Westlands and some have offices in low-income settlements such as Kibera, Mathare, and Buruburu. The initial contact between a victim of violence and a civil society actor is a face-to-face interaction, hence we decided to focus the survey on social capital, trust, and networks. The aim of the survey became:

‘To explore the vulnerability in relation to state violence of poor urban residents in Nairobi with a focus on the importance of social support structures and paralegal organisations.’

Based on the presence of ‘people on the ground’ - i.e. paralegals, human rights defenders, and community workers - the research team decided to partner with a paralegal organisation in Nairobi Eastlands and carry out the survey in low-income settlements in Eastleigh South Location. Professional enumerators interviewed 500 respondents during March 2015. After data cleaning and entry, the initial data analysis formed a basis for cross-tabulations and further statistical analysis. However, a data set of 500 entries has considerable limitations, including in making advanced statistical analysis, and the research project will include qualitative follow-that is outside the scope of this report.

Key Findings:

Demographic Information: More than half of the respondents were female (57.2%), 58.4% heads of household, three quarters (75.4%) were 39 years and below, 68% were married, 84.2% were tenants, and more than half (55.2%) had lived in the area for more than 2 years. Half of the respondents had completed primary education and 33% had completed secondary education. 78.8% had an average monthly household income of KES 15,000 and below, 42.6% were self-employed in the informal sector and 25% were unemployed.

Social Capital: The survey established that 55% did not trust their immediate neighbours, including 19% that did ‘not at all’ trust their neighbours, whereas 45% indicated a good level of trust with their neighbours. In relation to social functioning, respondents indicated that they participate with little difficulty in family life, work, education, and social life, whereas 23% indicated great difficulty to participate in political life. In terms of associational life and support, about half (51%) were members in a social association; in table banking or ‘chamas’ (42%), religious groups (17%), CBOs (14%), and community policing (11%). Amongst these respondents, about half had received social or financial support during the past 12 months; mostly from table banking and less than 10% from CBOs, NGOs, and religious groups.

Experiences of Violence: During the past 12 months, 45% incidences of violence, were experienced with 25% of the respondents reporting about their own experience of violence (124 cases). The most common forms of violence were robbery, beating, and threats, and, importantly, the most common place of violence was within the household by perpetrators from outside the household. Thus, the violence took place at home but it is not domestic violence in the common sense of between people living under the same roof. Almost half of the perpetrators were organised groups (44%) and one quarter were police officers (26%), whereas neighbours made up 9% of the perpetrators, and family members 4%. About one fifth of the perpetrators (17%) were ‘unknown’ to the victims. The perpetrators had used physical strength, hard objects, and sharp pointed weapons (rarely firearms) to cause physical injuries, especially cuts and bruises but also loss of body parts and functions.

Immediate Assistance: 77 (37.69%) of the victims did not receive any assistance after the incident. Amongst those who did, about two out of three victims were helped by family (30%) or neighbours (17%) to go to the police (28%), provide emotional support (26%) or access to treatment (14%).

Reporting and Justice: 38% of the victims reported to the police and 72% of these say that the police attended to the case and 42% of these cases led to a ‘resolution’. However, only 26% say that justice was served. Reporting to the police is lower when the police are the perpetrators. Family members, chiefs, paralegals, and community policing members support victims to access justice through accompaniment to the police station, emotional comfort, access to medical assistance and counselling, access to alternative dispute resolution, and transport to a health facility and access to legal aid. Most respondents felt that these efforts contributed to resolving the issues, but most did not feel that justice was served.

Conclusions

We can make the following conclusions about vulnerability in relation to violence among the urban poor resident in Nairobi Eastlands:

- High level of violence: every fourth respondent informed about their own experience
- The household is the most common scene of violence
- Organized groups and police are the main perpetrators
- Most common forms of violence are robbery, beating, threats
- Most injuries are cuts and bruises by physical strength, hard objects, sharp weapons
- It is more common to report violence by organized groups than police violence
- Low levels of sense that justice was served
- Low levels of trust and participation in associational life
- Low levels of awareness about where to access legal and medical support
- Victims want protection - organizations provide legal aid and rehabilitation
Key recommendations

1. National government policing initiatives
   - Policing initiatives like community policing and Nyumba Kumi must address the issue that most violence is often perpetrated at household level by people in the neighbourhood.
   - Policing initiatives must consider independent complaint and oversight mechanisms at community level to ensure compliance with the law and reduce the involvement of law enforcement agencies and actors in the perpetration of violence.

2. Government and civil society organisations
   - Address the every day violence amongst the urban poor
   - Change attitudes amongst the urban poor towards acceptance of police use of violence in terms of threats, intimidation, kicks, slaps, punches, and whipping.
   - Improve reporting behaviour to include ‘minor’ injuries from criminal gangs
   - Generate research-based knowledge on the dynamics of vulnerability to violence amongst the urban poor; and the link between extortion and violence in poor urban neighborhoods.

3. Civil society organisations
   - Human rights organisations should recognize victims’ interest in protection
   - Explore collaboration between human rights organisations with mandate to address violence and organisations ‘on the ground’ to: i) raise awareness on provisions regarding law enforcement and the conduct of LEAs, ii) Improve documentation, and iii) strengthen the mechanisms for protection of vulnerable members from violence.
   - Use technology to better capture and respond to violence on the ground
1. INTRODUCTION

Human rights organizations often tend not to focus on torture and ill-treatment in urban centres, let alone in poor urban neighbourhoods in Africa and beyond. However, with an increasing urban population there is an ever-greater need to explore more closely the prevalence and nature of torture and ill-treatment in poor urban neighbourhoods. This report aims to do just that by looking at the situation in Nairobi City, where after decades of uncontrolled population explosion, there has been a proliferation of informal settlements, with 60-70% of Nairobi residents estimated to be living in slums. Across the Global South, the urban poor are vulnerable to torture and other forms of ill-treatment by law enforcement agents and their proxies. They are also the least able to access forms of accountability, thereby perpetuating the structural inequalities that lie at the heart of poverty. As such, producing evidence about the prevalence and experience of torture and ill-treatment is a first step in improving access to justice and human security.

The origins of Nairobi’s slums can be traced back to the pre-independence period, when the urban layout was based on government-sanctioned population segregation into separate enclaves for Africans, Asians and Europeans. The highly unbalanced allocation of public resources towards the housing and infrastructural needs of the separate sections led to unplanned and poorly serviced developments. With the relaxation of colonial residential segregation during the post-colonial period, major population shifts occurred, with an increase of rural-to-urban migration, with little interference with the proliferation of urban slums. This led to the emergence of slums located in different directions of the city and informed by the proximity to employment opportunities, the main spatial segregation factor being socio-economic and cultural.

In slum contexts, documentation of torture has proved to be an arduous task, often too complicated for smaller NGOs and human rights organizations. Not only are the residents of slums particularly vulnerable to torture and ill-treatment, but they can also be very hard for human rights organisations to reach. Many human rights organisations have a relatively limited presence in poor neighbourhoods. Often evidence produced does not meet the standards required by a host of international, regional, and national human rights treaty bodies. This is the reason why Independent Medico-Legal Unit (IMLU), Edinburgh University and DIGNITY embarked on a collaborative research project in 2014 with two broad objectives.

1.1 Research Objectives

The research project set out to explore the documentation practices of local human rights organizations and compare them to the documentation standards required by different human rights treaty bodies. This was done through discussions with NGOs in Nairobi that work on governance and human rights. Preliminary interviews with these NGOs found that they work with a broad notion of torture; there is a lot of specialization in the sector as various organizations work with women, children, land,

---

2 A large majority of urban populations in Africa live in slums, with the continent said to be experiencing the highest urban growth at 3.5 percent per year, compared to other regions: Asia 2.03 percent, Europe 0.36m percent, Latin America and the Caribbean 1.23 percent and North America 1.04 percent (African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC). 2014. Population and Health Dynamics in Nairobi’s Informal Settlements, http://aphrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/NCSS2-FINAL-Report.pdf) Furthermore, the majority of this population lives with poor sanitation, no clean water and few social amenities, with some studies suggesting that the number of Africa’s urban slum population is as high as 60 percent (Kei Otsuki, Solutions for a Desirable and Sustainable Future Vol. 4, Issue 5, October 2013)


4 Ibid

5 Ibid
refugees, and medical treatment. It was also confirmed that there were many competent actors with high specialization in Nairobi, offering legal aid, while few offer health/counselling (rehabilitation services). There exists a very good referral mechanism at organizational level which helps enhance the competence in the sector. Most of these organisations provided information on their ‘presence on the ground’ in slum areas of Nairobi, in the form of paralegals, human rights monitors, volunteer professionals and partnerships with community based organisations (CBOs), and religious institutions.

These initial discussions also established the need to do a survey among victims and potential victims in poor urban neighbourhoods to understand the extent and nature of victimisation and examine the implications of “people on the ground”, that is local organizations, on reporting. The latter issue was deemed relevant because the standard documentation tools often miss out a lot, especially the actual experience of poor and vulnerable populations. The survey would look into how relevant these “people on the ground” are for victims to report torture and ill-treatment and what measures can be taken to improve their capacities and increase documentation.

We decided to focus on violence, and state violence more specifically, rather than the narrower human rights categories of torture and ill-treatment. This was done due to the need to examine state violence as experienced by the residents of slums, rather than assume a priori the forms that it might take.

The overall aim was to address the presumed lacuna in documentation practices in relation to state violence in poor, urban neighbourhoods through the production of robust, scientific knowledge on the prevalence and / or nature of torture and ill-treatment in Nairobi. As part of this second objective IMLU, the project’s Kenyan partner, with the assistance of DIGNITY carried out a quantitative survey in a poor, urban neighbourhood in Nairobi that was focused on the key objective:

To explore vulnerability in relation to state violence of poor urban residents in Nairobi, with a specific focus on the importance of social support structures and paralegal organizations and;

1.2 Outline

This report presents the survey results with a view to exploring the manifestations of violence and people’s perceptions of violence, police effectiveness and justice. After an introduction to the methodological concerns (Chapter 2), the demographic profile of the respondents and the levels of trust, associational life and social functioning (Chapter 3), will form a basis for understanding the respondents’ perceptions of violence, the use of violence by authorities and violence prevention efforts. Chapter 4 presents the experiences of violence and very concerning findings in relation to frequency, perpetrators, setting, forms, and implications of violence. Chapter 5 turns to the assistance that victims may receive and justice seeking, both through the police and other local authorities. The starting point in torture and ill-treatment encourages a focus on police violence as the common form of state violence in the survey context. That said, we are also interested in people’s perceptions of police effectiveness and service delivery, and the opinions of victims and others regarding appropriate interventions. Chapter 6 is a discussion of the main survey findings and leads to the Conclusion and Recommendations in Chapter 7.
2.3 Mapping and Sampling

We conducted a door-to-door survey of the various households in the three slums; however, we were unable to get the aerial maps from the Kenya Bureau of Statistics. In the absence of aerial maps, we mapped out the slums through identifying boundaries of each slum, then mapped the pathways and identified physical features such as stone storey houses, schools, hospitals, trees, and public toilets managed by community groups.

Because of the challenge of getting the aerial maps, we were unable to show in our maps the individual houses. As a result we selected the households in each slum through the random sampling techniques discussed below.

After the mapping had been finalised, a quantitative survey was undertaken. This was done through administering a structured questionnaire with checklists and open ended questions to the selected respondents. Five enumerators and one field supervisor conducted the data collection. Each enumerator began the survey by randomly selecting a starting point from a boundary map of the slum.

The team supervisor predetermined a number of possible starting points based on the generally identifiable location of each slum. Each enumerator selected a piece of paper with a starting point number. Once at the starting point, the enumerators used a random walk method, randomly selecting the direction in which to travel from the starting point, then selecting every fourth household.

At each household, the survey team would request to speak to the household head or a member of the household who was over 18 years of age. If the household head or an adult member of the family were not available, the survey team would explain the nature of their visit and ask if there was a time when they could return and speak with an adult member of the household. The team then proceeded to the next household and made appointments as necessary so that the objective of filling out the questionnaires was successful. If the household head was available, the team would explain the nature of their visit and ask if it is possible to speak to him or her. If the necessary respondents from a household were not available over a period of two days, the team would select another household.

Random sampling enabled the enumerators to include a wide range of variables including levels of poverty, violence and crime, gender and age. Interviews were only carried out after having explained the purpose of the interview, assured the interviewee of confidentiality, and obtained their explicit consent.

The estimation of the data sample was based on information of approximately 10,000 households in one ward as per information from Kenya Bureau of Statistics.

The sample size was distributed equally among the three settlements selected. For a total population of 10,000 Households, the resultant number considering a 5% non-response rate was approximately 370 respondents (sample size). However, for this study, we increased this sample size to 500 respondents. We targeted to interview at least 25 households per day for 20 days.

2.4 Data Collection

Once the initial mapping and sampling had been finalized, the survey questionnaire was piloted in 40 households within the survey site. After a review of the test results, the data collection began.

The data collection team comprised of five enumerators and one field supervisor. The enumerators administered the questionnaire at household level while the field supervisor carried out spot checks for quality control. The supervisor visited the field twice a week to check that the sampling method was being adhered to during selection of households, collected the questionnaires, and reviewed them for accuracy before submitting them to the statistician for data entry and analysis. The enumerators being
outsider professional researchers were accompanied by paralegals from KAPLET, a local NGO with operations in the study sites for access and security. To facilitate this accompaniment IMLU established a collaboration with KAPLET based on their current referral relationship in which KAPLET refers cases to torture to IMLU for psychological, medical and legal support. IMLU also provided logistical support to the data collectors throughout the data collection. The decision to include accompaniment of paralegals was very useful in ensuring full access to the area, cooperation of majority of respondents and security to the enumerators.

2.5 Quality Assurance

Data validation encompasses the processes to ensure high quality of the data recorded. It is imperative that regular validation processes are undertaken of data recorded on the questionnaires. For this task, we had a Field Supervisor whose role was to supervise the data collection and ensure quality assurance. Supervisory visits to the field were conducted twice a week. Questionnaires were collected on these days. Any questionnaires that had discrepancies were corrected before leaving the field. On each day of interviews, about 5 interviews were conducted per enumerator. A day or so later, the questionnaires were sent to the data entry clerk after going through a sample check to ensure consistency and quality. Those questionnaires that needed correction were sent back to the respective enumerator. The questionnaires were designed in such a way that no names of individual respondents or households were disclosed. The questionnaires were stored in a secure place with lock and key within IDC and IMLU offices. This ensured privacy and confidentiality of the respondents, as well as of the data collected. The data collected from the fieldwork was stored in password protected computers, both at the statistician’s and IMLU offices.

2.6 Ethical Issues

The survey was carried out in a way to avoid risks to participants, respondents, and interviewers. We took cognisance of the fact that all research involves human subjects, the researcher needs to be attentive to the ethical manner in which the research is carried out. A basic guideline was adopted to ensure no individual suffered any adverse consequences as a result of the survey.

There were, hence, important ethical guidelines that the interviewers followed during the data collection. The most important were respecting the anonymity of the respondents and the confidentiality of their responses. It was always important to secure the informed consent of the people we interviewed. So no names were given on the questionnaires.

Interviewers were trained and reminded that, as an introduction to the interviews, they should seek consent from the respondents. The enumerators and the supervisor were also provided with two sessions of psychological debriefing, one at the middle of the exercise and one at the end of data collection, to prevent vicarious trauma, due to their exposure to traumatic experiences narrated by respondents. All enumerators accessed this support and found it very helpful in enabling them to cope and have the courage to pose difficult and challenging questions.

2.7 Data Processing and Analysis

All the filled-in questionnaires were submitted to the statistician twice a week. After cross-checking them, he forwarded them to the data entry clerk to input the data into a computer excel file. When all data had been entered in the excel file, it was sent back to the Statistician, who would export it to the SPSS statistics software for data cleaning and analysis. A data cleaning and analysis plan was developed together with the statistician to guide the two processes.
Cross tabulations were generated by using the questionnaire and using other variables as discussed with the Dignity, Edinburg and IMLU team via email and at a review meeting held in Nairobi the first week of May 2015.

### 2.8 Methodological Challenges

The survey took place during working hours limiting the interviews to persons at home like housewives, offspring, unemployed youth, and male and female small business owners with businesses in the area. A percentage of potential employed male respondents who might have had a different experience did not participate since they were away at work. This was partly mitigated by the survey tool that encouraged those interviewed to narrate the experiences of absent members of their household. In the end, the survey included 57.2% female and 42.8% male respondents. Similar disparities between men and women in household surveys are relatively common.

Secondly, conducting the survey during working hours in a residential area inadvertently meant interrupting households in their day to day affairs. This in turn affected the duration of time it took to complete an interview, with interviews in many instances taking longer than expected, as they were conducted amidst respondents haggling over prices of wares with their customers. Part of this challenge was addressed by the selection of experienced enumerators who exercised patience and tact to ensure that there was minimal interruption of the livelihood activities of the respondents.

Security and access to the survey site was a key challenge that presented itself immediately when we chose ‘outsiders’ as enumerators who were unknown to the residents, were not familiar with the terrain and were from a different socio-economic status than the residents, hence exposed to higher levels of insecurity.

There was also a level of difficulty in securing the cooperation of respondents. In some households, there was evident restraint by respondents at the beginning of the interviewees who later opened up as the session progressed; a few held back throughout the interview. In one instance, a respondent even called the enumerator back after the interview requesting her to assure him of his safety regarding the information he had shared concerning the police. The respondent said that the neighbour who seemingly had been eavesdropping scared him into wondering whether the enumerator was a CID (Crime Investigation Department) officer.

There was also a level of hostility from some potential respondents, with some respondents who were approached being unresponsive and giving no chance to explain what the research was all about, but rather responding that they are used to “people who carry files around” (meaning researchers) and that they didn’t get any help after the surveys. Related to the latter was an expectation of monetary compensation by some respondents. Other negative reactions included allegations and shouting by some residents, both sober and intoxicated, that this was a political scheme sourcing for votes for a certain politician. Some respondents expected gains in the very near future – some financial gain. This challenge was addressed by clarifying upfront that though there were no immediate personal benefits, the survey had potential communal benefits in the long term.

While the choice of ‘outsider’ enumerators was to ensure objectivity, distance and safeguard the quality of data, we chose to partner with KAPLET, a paralegal CBO based in the survey site to accompany the enumerators. The support of the paralegals was critical for the success of the data collection as they played a multiple role of security, enabling access, securing cooperation of respondents, explaining the purpose of the survey and developing rapport with local leaders. Though the enumerators tried to remain inconspicuous, they stood out and may have put respondents on edge especially because asking questions elicits an air of interrogation which respondents are generally suspicious of.
There was more resistance to participation in the survey in one of the three villages, which we consider was because the paralegals were not well known to the residents, and some youths in the area complained that they had a team of paralegals that was not involved in the survey. This speaks to the need to include local people in survey efforts, as there are serious concerns about who is allowed to represent the community. In these instances both the enumerators and the paralegals felt threatened.

Many respondents had low literacy levels, which affected the understanding of abstract concepts. To address this challenge, the approach employed was translating the questions to Swahili and Sheng (local Slang that is a mix of English, Swahili and Kenyan Ethnic languages). Also, where it was necessary, translation was done in the specific ethnic language if it was shared by the respondent and the enumerator. Such cases occurred less often and tended to involve participants over 50 with little or no education. Most participants spoke and understood Swahili and Sheng.

Another challenge was the lack of maps of the study area. While the research team managed to get hard copy maps as well as GIS images on CD from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, the extraction of information failed due to the lack of a GIS platform in the implementing organisations. Further follow up with the KNBS officials was not successful hence the reason we have used photo images taken during the survey.

The working conditions were difficult with harsh weather and poor sanitation in the three areas. The survey was conducted in the beginning of the rainy season, and when it rained, some of the areas in the slums became impassable and very difficult to access. However, the enumerators handled it with grace and patience.

The sample size does not allow for cross-tabulation analysis between associational life versus levels of trust and gender for example or between the location versus associational life, trust, and social functioning.

Finally, it appears as though the numbers in the survey regarding sexual violence and domestic violence are quite low. Ethnographic fieldwork exploring women’s safety strategies carried out after the survey had ended by two Master’s students affiliated to DIGNITY suggests high levels of partner violence, sexual and domestic violence. We can only speculate that the household survey technique might be less appropriate to capture sexual violence than other forms of violence at the hands of perpetrators from outside the household.

While it is regrettable that the data set does not allow for further details about the victims exposed to various forms of violence and the impact of violence and other challenges, the survey nevertheless managed to elucidate important lessons about violence in the three survey sites.
3. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

This chapter introduces the survey respondents and highlights the features most relevant for the data analysis. The survey comprised interview with 500 respondents. The sample was distributed according to the size of each of the three informal settlements that made up the survey site with respectively 39%, 31% and 30% of the respondents.

3.1 Demographic Profile

57.2% (286) of respondents were female and 42.8% (214) were male. Out of the total interviewed 58.4% (292) were heads of households, compared to 41.6% (208) who were not. Out of 500 respondents 75.4% were 39 years and below. 68% were married, while 16.4% reported as never married and 15.6% divorced, separated or widowed.

Half of the respondents (50.2%) had only reached a primary school level of education. 4.6% went on from primary school to have vocational training. 33.4% had some level of secondary education, and 6.6% partook of some form of post-secondary vocational training, while only 1.0% accessed college or university level education.

Table 1: Questions regarding Social network and the corresponding score of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Social Capital</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which of the following types of groups in your community have you been an active member during the past one year?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the last one year, have you received social or financial support from any of the following?</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the last year have you gained access to social or financial support through referral or information from any of the following individuals?</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32.5% of all heads of household in the sample were female. At the same time, male respondents were nearly three times as likely to be in this position (92.1%) as female respondents (32.5%), suggesting that if there is a man in the household, he tends to head it. The survey itself did not record household size. However, according to the enumerators, most households comprise of a young couple with one child, an indication of minimal intergenerational cohabitation.

The majority of the households in the survey 78.8% (393) had an average monthly household income of Kshs. 15,000 (USD156) and below. Of the total number of respondents, 25.0% were unemployed while 55.8% were informal sector self-employed, the latter being petty traders selling commodities ranging from food items to clothing on the streets or outside their slum dwellings.

Of the total interviewed, 84.2% lived in rented premises while 14% ‘owned’ the premises they lived in; the latter being landlords who owned the shanty dwellings and partially rented part of it and lived in the other part of their dwelling. This finding seems to resonate with another study in 1999 which found that over 80% in five of the six slums covered were tenants, with owner-occupiers in four of the five slums being less than 10%. The remaining 1.8% (9 respondents) in the sample were caretakers of the house they lived in.
3.2 Social Capital: Networks, Trust and Functioning

In this section, we present a discussion on the social capital of respondents and explore their linkages to mechanisms through which individuals deal with violence and crime in poor urban slums in this survey context.

First, however, it is important to define the concept of community as understood in the study area and in this survey report. We refer to three levels of community:

1) Household level which was the focus of interaction with individual respondents,
2) Immediate neighbourhood (mtaa) with was a defined as the households within the immediate vicinity or about ten households, and
3) ‘Within your location/village’ is understood as the entire settlement. In this case, Kinyago, Kanuku and Mugunda would be regarded as three different locations/villages. For instance people in Kinyago regard Mugunda as a different location/village from their own.

Having established the three levels of understanding community (household, mtaa, location/village), we proceed to discuss social capital as a function of trust, functioning and networks. This is important in a violence survey like this one since it has been suggested that crime and violence erode social capital through reduction of trust and co-operation within formal and informal social organisations.⁷

Social Networks

Respondents were asked about their affiliation to social associations during the last one year, and if they had received social or financial support from any groups. Respondents were also asked whether they had gained access to social or financial support through referral or information from any individuals. The questions were accompanied by a set of response options from which the respondents had to choose. After the respondents answered the questions, a score was derived based on the number of items the respondent chose from the list.

**Residence in survey site:** More than half of the respondents (55.2%) have lived in the area for 1-10 years, adequate time for social, cultural, economic and political dynamics to emerge that would provide an insight into the coping mechanisms in relation to violence and crime. Only 11.0% have lived there for less than a year.

**Membership:** 256 (51.2%) respondents indicated they were a member of an association in the last one year. 169 (66.0%) belonged to a men’s or women’s group (chama) while religious organisations ranked second with 59 persons (23%). Out of the 169 who belonged to a chamas, 122 (72.2%) were women, whereas it was more common for men to belong to work related organisation (28 men and only 5 women).

**Social and financial support:** 149 respondents - (58.2%) of the 256 respondents who said they belonged to an association - had received social or financial support from a men’s or women’s group (chama), while just 37 had received similar support from community-based organisations and 25 had received from work related organisations. More women had received support from ‘chamas’ than men, while more men had received support from work-related organisations as compared to women, which

---

⁷Crime in Nairobi Results of a Citywide Victim Survey
⁸Men/Women’s groups, Work related organisations (e.g. trade unions, hawkers/vendors associations). Religious groups (e.g. Catholic, Anglican, Muslim), Political groups, Cooperatives/credits/lending associations, Community/people’s/Youth organisations (e.g. funeral groups, income generating groups), Community policing (Nyumba kumi, Vigilantes’), NGO/CBOs
⁹A “Chama” is the Swahili word for a formal or informal grouping of people that come together for social economic purposes, mainly within mtaa or location/village or based or religious, ethnic, work place or gender basis. Most of them are not registered with government regulatory bodies. However as group invests more in economic activities e.g. savings and loan or acquisition of assets they tend get formalised by registering with regulatory bodies. Group members may have a range from 5 to 30 or sometimes more. These group also serve as social security, with members assisting each other in case of misfortunes like deaths in family, bailing out in case and education support arrest, and other family needs like organizing weddings, education support.
corresponds with the gender differences in terms of membership to a ‘chama’ or a work related organisation. Amongst the 222 respondents who had received social or financial support in the last one year, 28 received from two sources and three respondents received aid from 3 sources. Out of these, the biggest portion were referred by friends who are not neighbours (18%), neighbours (11.7%), relatives (7.2%), and NGOs/CBOs/Paralegals at 2.3% or 5 referrals only.

**Communal action:** 265 persons or 55% of respondents had worked with other community members in addressing a common problem. Almost one third (35.8%) had reported a problem to government officials, 16.2% to community leaders and 3.0% to CBOs.

**Trust**

More than half (55.2%) of the respondents indicated that they did not trust their immediate neighbours - ‘not much’ or ‘not at all’ - while 44.8% indicated good level of trust towards their neighbours. These low levels of trust are significant in relation to the levels of violence discussed below.

**Social Functioning**

The survey inquired into people’s social functioning based on ICF categories\(^{10}\), the assumption being that the higher the level of violence in an area, the greater the likelihood of low social functioning. Using a five point scale, the respondents were asked to rate their functioning in four key areas: family life, work and education, community, social and political life.

**Table 2: Question regarding Social Functioning and the Corresponding Score of Respondents by ICF Categorisation\(^{11}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Five point scale and percentage of answers from respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I am able to participate in and maintain my family relations..... | 54.4% With no difficulty  
20.7% With little difficulty  
15.9% With some difficulty  
8.6% With much difficulty  
0.4% With absolute difficulty |
| I am able to participate in work or education..... | 51.9% With no difficulty  
23.8% With little difficulty  
15.2% With some difficulty  
8.6% With much difficulty  
0.4% With absolute difficulty |
| I am able to participate in community and social life..... | 63.7% With no difficulty  
20.4% With little difficulty  
10.6% With some difficulty  
5.0% With much difficulty  
0.2% With absolute difficulty |
| I am able to participate in political life..... | 60.4% With no difficulty  
10.1% With little difficulty  
6.5% With some difficulty  
9.1% With much difficulty  
13.8% With absolute difficulty |

N=500 (2/1/1/7 missing)

75.1% of respondents indicated that they are able to participate in family life with little or no difficulty. An equally high number of respondents (75.7%) indicated that they are able to participate in work and education with little or no difficulty. Participation in social and community life was even easier, with 84.1% of respondents indicating that they were able to participate with little or no difficulty.

However, the picture was different for participation in political life with 70.5% indicating they are able to participate in political life with little or no difficulty, but a significant 22.9% of respondents indicating they have ‘much difficulty’ or ‘absolute difficulty’ in participating in political life as compared to family (9.0%); education (9.0%); or social life (5.2%).

**3.3 Summary**

The study indicates that relatively young couples inhabited most of the households, with 75.4% of respondents below 39 years of age. According to the enumerators, most households comprise a young

---

\(^{10}\) The four questions regarding social functioning were based on the following ICF categories: d240: Handling stress d other psychological demands; d760: Family relationships; d810: Education; d850: remunerative employment; and d910: Community life

\(^{11}\) ICF is the International Classification of Functioning, created by WHO as an alternative to ICD that focuses on disease rather than functioning.
couple with one child, an indication of minimal intergenerational cohabitation. The small family sizes resonate with a 2012 cross-sectional slums survey in Nairobi, which showed that fertility in the slums in 2012 was relatively higher in 2008-09 (3.5 and 2.8 children per woman, respectively), but lower than the national level (4.6) and that of rural areas (5.2) at the time. This finding also resonates with another study on inequalities in Kenya, which indicates that more than half of the urban households have three or fewer household members. This may be explained by the fact that most rural-urban migration in Kenya tends to comprise of young persons seeking employment in urban areas while the older generation remains in the agricultural oriented rural economies of Kenya.

The majority of the households in the survey 78.8% (393) had an average monthly household income of Ksh. 15,000 (USD156) and below. Nationally, 45.2 percent of the population lives below the poverty line (2009 estimates), down from 46 percent in 2005/06. According to the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and Society for International Development (SID) the ‘below poverty line’ factor may not give us a clear indication of the socio-economic status of the residents of the survey areas. The KNBS and SID propose the use of household consumption expenditure as a more reliable indicator. Their joint 2013 report indicates that household expenditure in Kenya averages Ksh3,440 per adult equivalent per month nationally and Ksh6,010 in urban areas. Using this argument, most of the residents in the survey areas were relatively poor, with their average monthly household income of 15,000 and below only able to afford the monthly household consumption expenditure of one to two household members.

Like other studies in Nairobi slums, the life of most of the respondents is tenuous with a quarter of them unemployed, while most of those in employment are in informal self-employment involving petty trade on the street. These findings resonate with a study dealing with enumeration of slum residents in Huruma, a neighboring slum by the Pamoja Trust, the largest single occupation group being small scale enterprise, followed by casual laborers, artisans, and formal employment as watchmen, domestic workers, clerks, and waiters. This tenuous life is perceived by respondents to increase their vulnerability to violence, as many find themselves with hardly any means to earn a living, and according to qualitative accounts from respondents collected during the survey, most of the young among them end up in alcoholism, drugs and crime. Like in other similar studies, there is a strong perception among respondents that unemployment especially among the youth is a key driver of violence. However the survey findings are not conclusive on the link between unemployment and violence, and this unemployment/poverty-violence nexus requires further research, which could lead to identification of sustainable solutions to violence in the study areas.

The survey findings show that social capital is built around men and women groups (chama), religious organizations and family, rather than neighbours. This is demonstrated by the number of respondents who belong to these associations and the accrued benefits. The high numbers affiliated to chama may indicate the level of support accruable from membership, with the survey showing these groups leading in providing social or financial support to the members, with community/peoples/youth organisations coming a distant second, followed by work related organisations. There is a gender difference as more women rely more on chamas and more men rely on work-related organisations for social and financial support.

13 Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and Society for International Development (SID) 2013, Exploring Kenya’s Inequality: Pulling Apart or Pooling Together? Nairobi
14 Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and Society for International Development (SID) 2013, Exploring Kenya’s Inequality: Pulling Apart or Pooling Together? Nairobi
15 Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and Society for International Development (SID) 2013, Exploring Kenya’s Inequality: Pulling Apart or Pooling Together? Nairobi
The majority of those who received social and financial support did so through referrals by friends who were not neighbours. The findings on who came to the assistance of victims of violence also reflect this reality in social capital with most respondents indicating that they received immediate support from family. In addition family also features prominently as the main source of support in accessing justice for victims of violence.

While neighbours feature in responses to immediate assistance in cases of violence, referrals for financial/social support and support in accessing justice, their rating is low compared to family and chama. Immediate neighbours are also rated low in relation to trust as over 50% indicating they do not trust their immediate neighbours. This may be linked to the perception among many respondents that perpetrators of violence reside ‘within the immediate neighbourhood’.

On **social functioning**, over three quarters of respondents indicated that they are able to participate in work and education with little or no difficulty while a third were rated under ‘much difficulty’ or absolute difficulty’ with regard to participating in political life. The majority of the respondents who indicated they were able to participate in political life were women. This contrasts with the fact that women were among the majority of those who indicated they found it ‘much difficulty’ or absolute difficulty’ in participating in political life. While this can partly be explained by the fact that women comprised the majority of respondents to this question, it would require a qualitative survey to understand why there were a significant percentage of total respondents who found it difficult to participate in political life, and why women comprised a majority in this category.
4. PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF VIOLENCE

The section sets out the survey findings in relations to perceptions and the direct experiences of violence. Measuring perceptions is important, as it is a crucial part of the ways in which violence is experienced and can also act as a predictor of how people react to violence as a social concern.

4.1 Perceptions of Violence and Perpetrators

The survey inquired into eight types of violence. On a three point scale ranging from less often via often to very often, the respondents were asked to assess how frequently these types of violence occurred in their neighbourhood (‘mtaa’). As Table 3 shows, robbery was the type most frequently named as occurring often or very often at 67.1%, followed by fighting, threats, intimidations and harassment, as well as beatings and extortion. Shootings, killings and sexual violence were perceived as occurring less often, though in the latter case, this might be due to it being a taboo.

Table 3: Subjective assessment of frequency of occurrence of types of violence in neighbourhood/mtaa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/Intimidation/ Harassment</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beating/Kupigwa</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extortion</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Violence</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=500 (2/1/3/2/11/11/17/17 missing)

Certain types of violence are most likely underreported in this survey due to respondents considering some forms of violence as normal and therefore not relevant to report (‘normalization’ of violence such as extortion and bruising) or ‘too violent’, for example shooting or extra judicial killing, and therefore perceived as too dangerous to report.

Most respondents perceived criminal gangs/groups as the main perpetrators of violence (61.2%) followed by the police (18.7%), with the least being spouse/relatives/parent at 4.2%. When asked about the provenance of the perpetrators, respondents were allowed multiple answers. 60.4% of the respondents felt that the perpetrators of violence resided ‘within the immediate neighbourhood’ (mtaa). 29% perceived them as coming from the wider circle of the village, whereas 42.2% view the perpetrators as living ‘outside the village/mtaa’.

Figure 2: Perceived main perpetrators of violence

![Figure 2: Perceived main perpetrators of violence](image)

**Level of violence:** A majority of respondents (82.9%) thought that violence had not increased since 2013.
4.2 Perceptions of Violence Prevention

Using a five point scale (very effective, effective, moderately effective, ineffective, very ineffective), respondents were asked about their views regarding the effectiveness of government efforts to solve the problem of violence in their areas (3 villages). In the questionnaire, government and authorities were categorised as: local authorities, national government, community leaders, county government.

Local authorities (chiefs, community policing committees, members of county assembly) were rated the highest with 50.7% of respondents saying they thought their efforts were effective or very effective, followed by national government (police, etc.) at 44.9%, community leaders at 38.3%, and county government at 7.4%.

4.3 Perceptions on the Use of Violence

This section relates to respondents’ views of the acceptability of the use of violence in different scenarios. Overall most respondents felt that violence was not justified regardless of the guilt or innocence of the person.

When asked whether it is okay for the police to use force on a minor suspected of having committed a crime, only 17 out of the 497 respondents answering the question (3.4%) felt it was ok. That score changed significantly when the minor was found guilty of a crime, as 13.5% felt it was then okay to use force.

Females were more likely than males to approve of police force against a minor found guilty, respectively 15.5% of women and 10.7% of men. Data from South Africa suggests that women often call upon the state to discipline their children in the absence of decisive parental intervention from fathers.18

When asked whether it is acceptable that the police use force on an adult suspected of committing a crime, only 5.6% thought it was ok. When the adult caught by the police was guilty of a crime, those who thought it was okay to use force on them rose to 15.1%.

Women are more accepting of police force than men are. In the case of police catching an adult suspected of committing a crime, 8.8% female thought it was okay, compared to 1.4% men. And when the adult was guilty, 18.7% females responded that it was okay, compared to 10.3% men. Again, while the figures do not reveal the reasons for the gender discrepancy, we may speculate as well that it is caused by the fact that those beaten up in the great majority would be perceived to be men.

4.4 Experiences of Violence

The survey captured a total of 245 cases of violence that had taken place since 2013, approximately a 12-month period. 124 (24.8%) respondents reported having been direct victims of violence. Respondents reported furthermore that their sons (18) or daughters (4) had experienced violence or that their husbands (24) or wives (2) had been targeted – this suggests that men are more likely targets or that the kinds of violence men experience are paid more attention to. 68 other household members were also reported to have been victims of violence. 205 households reported having suffered incidences of violence. Out of the 124 in which the respondents themselves had experienced violence, there were 65 females and 59 males.

4.5 Forms of Violence, Location, and Perpetrator

Within the 205 households in which violence had been experienced, more than two fifth had had a violent encounter with a thief or a gang, and just over a quarter reported police violence. With mere thirteen incidences, violence in the family was reported least often (see Table 4).
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### Table 4: Perpetrators of violence reported by household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thief/Gang</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger/Unknown assailant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of households with experience of violence in past year</strong></td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3: Type of violence by perpetrator reported on household level

![Bar chart showing type of violence by perpetrator](chart)

Figure 3 above illustrates what forms of violence each perpetrator used. Thieves/gangs and unknown assailants commit mostly robberies and beatings; the police is reported to have engaged in a wide variety of forms of violence, with threats and beating being the most frequent.

Of the total who reported them or a family member having suffered violence since 2013, the statistics per type of violence were as follows:

**Robbery:** This was the most frequent form of violence experienced by the respondents or members of their household. 155 cases of robbery were reported, 107 of them in the neighbourhood and 48 within the household. The large majority of robberies were carried out by gangs, thieves and unknown assailants.

**Beating:** A total 86 respondents reported them or their relatives having suffered violence from beatings. Of this number, over three quarters had this experience within the neighbourhood as compared to within the household. Of the 19 who suffered beatings within the household, thieves/gangs led the list of perpetrators with 6 incidents, followed by family members (5), the police (4), neighbours (4) and unknown assailants (2). Out of the 67 who suffered beatings within the neighbourhood, 32 were from a gang/thief, followed by the police at 19, and by strangers/unknown assailants at 11.
Threats: A total of 44 respondents reported they or a relative had received threats, a majority of 36 within the neighbourhood. Police were the main perpetrators of threats with 23 incidents, followed by neighbour (6 incidents) and gang/thief (4 incidents). Of the 8 who reported having received threats from within household, three were victims of threats from the police, while two of the threats came from a neighbour.

Extortion: A total of 12 incidences of extortion were reported by the respondents, majority (11) of the incidences experienced in the neighbourhood and only 1 incidence within the household. Police lead in the reported incidences of extortion with 9 cases as compared to neighbours at 3.

Fighting: A total of 8 respondents reported that they or their relatives had experienced violence from fights mainly from family members within the household at 4 or 50%, followed by violence from neighbours at 2 or 25%.

Shooting: a total of 6 respondents reported experiencing violence from shootings, 4 of the incidences within the neighbourhood and 2 within the household. Majority of the shootings were by the police with 5 incidences, while 1 incident was attributed to a gang/thief.

Killings: Out of 5 persons reported killed, 4 were killed within the neighbourhood and 1 within the household. Majority (3) were killed by police, one by an unknown assailant and one by a thief/gang.

Sexual Violence: 5 cases of sexual violence were reported with 3 of the incidences experienced within the neighbourhood and 2 within the household. Out of the total number, 3 of the victims were respondents while 2 were relatives, with neighbours leading perpetrators at 3 and thief/gang and unknown assailant at one each.

4.6 Impact of Violence

What is the impact of violence on the victims and the community? Out of the 205 households reporting cases of violence, 102 named physical injuries. Of the total physical injury incidences reported, bruises and cuts were the most frequent (92). 7 people had died as a consequence of injuries. 6 people lost limbs/sight/reproductive ability or experienced chronic pain/numbness, while 5 suffered bullet wounds, 2 had burns, and 2 were paralysed.

171 households indicated that the violence impacted on the material and financial situation of the respondents and their relatives. In 129 cases the victims reported emotional strain while 33 suffered damage to family and social relations. The injuries had a heavy toll on 96 of the victims who stopped working or studying due to the injuries resulting from the violence.

4.7 Summary and discussion

The general perceptions of violence in this survey closely match experiences of violence with robbery, beating, and threats being rated as the most prevalent forms of both perceptions and experiences of violence.

In discussions with enumerators respondents attributed the high incidences of robberies to parental neglect, youth delinquency, school drop-outs and idleness, high poverty levels and lack of socio-economic opportunities and the acquiescence of chiefs and police in crime. Many respondents pointed to the police and the chief as pre-occupied with rent seeking with specific amounts or protection money set for various issues, often to be remitted on a regular basis. Fighting, on the other hand, was mainly attributed to the proliferation of illicit brewing and drugs, high prevalence of drugs and alcohol abuse, and acquiescence of chiefs and police in illicit brewing and drug trade and use, the latter being an avenue of rent seeking from the police and chiefs.
The statistical analysis suggests that beatings, intimidation/threats/ harassment and extortion are not common forms of violence, yet the enumerators’ notes indicate that many respondents did not want to discuss these forms of violence due to fear of reprisal from spouses, police officers or gang members, i.e. the main perpetrators of these forms of violence. This might also be the reason for the low levels of reported domestic and partner violence, where the survey results are qualified by the ethnographic fieldwork exploring women’s safety strategies in the survey sites. This research suggests that several of the women participating in the study had experienced quite brutal forms of partner violence to the extent where some of them had decided to ‘live without men’, as they put it.

Some forms of violence were underreported in this survey because respondents regarded these to be part of ‘normal’ life. For example, most respondents considered being ‘roughed up’, slapped or punched around by police as ‘normal’ – ‘these are things that the police do’. Hence, most respondents only reported a heightened, indeed unacceptable, level of violence, whereas a slap or kick from the police would have gone unreported in this study. This means that cases of being beaten would go unreported because the extent is not deemed to be outside of the jurisdiction of the police, that is, most respondents regard beatings e.g. slaps, kicks, blows, whipping from the police as ‘normal’ and would only report severe beatings that cause serious injuries. For example, if a person was beaten to the extent that they became disabled, it would be considered as an act of violence that was against the law and thus worth reporting.
5. ASSISTANCE, REPORTING AND JUSTICE

This section presents the survey findings on the assistance that the respondents, who had been victims of violence, got immediately after the incidence and their practices of reporting the violence and seeking justice.

5.1 Assistance

77 (37.6%) of the respondents who reported experience with violence reported receiving no assistance after the incidence. 65 (31.7%) of those who received immediate assistance got it from family; 37 (18.0%) from neighbours; 11 (5.4%) from the chief, and 10 (4.9%) from the police. Interestingly, paralegals, community policing groups, and guardians each gave less than 3% of the immediate assistance. While chamas is the main source of social and financial support, this form of local organisation was not relevant in the provision of immediate assistance in relation to violence. The important position of the chief and the police in providing immediate assistance partly explains the high rates of trust in local authorities and community leaders (see section 3.2).

5.2 Reporting and Justice

The questions concern awareness of respondents on where to report violence, the reporting patterns, and the level of satisfaction with actions taken when they report.

At perception level, 384 (76.8%) of the respondents indicated that they would report to the chief; 300 (60.0%) to the police; 114 (22.8%) to community policing groups. A smaller number would report to their family 53 (10.6%), neighbors 54 (10.8%) or 45 (9.0%) to NGOs/Paralegals.

In practice, 38.0% of the households with incidents of violence had reported these to the police, while 61.5% indicated that they had not reported (one respondent did not know). This is echoed in a similar survey by UN-HABITAT in 200219 in Nairobi city which indicated that only 25.3% of male and 19.6% of female victims of crime went to the police to report, while 67% did not report, because they were not satisfied with the police work, either due to inefficiency, lack of interest, or suspected collusion with criminals.

Table 5: Reporting patterns by perpetrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator of violence</th>
<th>Did you or any family member report to police?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>68.0% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thief/gang</td>
<td>45.5% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family member</td>
<td>38.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stranger</td>
<td>22.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.0% (78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above indicates, reporting to police is the lowest when the perpetrator was police, while respondents were much more likely to report neighbours and gang violence to the police.

---

Of the 77 who reported an incident of violence to the police, 60 (77.9%) indicated that the police gave attention to their complaint, while 34 (43.4%) indicated that the police response had led to some form of resolution. The type of resolution given through the police include:

- 15 cases: the suspect was arrested, taken to court and fined/sentenced.
- 8 cases: police recorded statements from witnesses and victims, gave P3 forms to victims, and launched investigations.
- 8 cases: the suspects were identified and the community leaders/chief/family resolved the case. In 3 cases, the suspect was arrested and killed by the police.

When asked why the cases reported to police did not reach a form of resolution, the respondents who answered this question gave various reasons with the failure by the police to carry out investigations and arrest the suspects being named in nearly half of the cases. Other reasons given were: police refusal to investigate because they were ‘compromised’ by the suspects or their relatives; cases son going in the courts; victims did not want to pursue the cases; lost property was never recovered; perpetrators either died or relocated/ran away.

*Table 6: Reasons, why the case was not resolved by Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure by the police to carry out investigations and arrest the suspects</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police refusal to investigate because they were compromised/bribed by the suspects or their relatives</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases still on going in the courts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims did not want to press charges/pursue the cases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost property was never recovered</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators either died or relocated/ran away</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving from reporting and resolution to justice, only 21 felt that justice was served.

*Table 7: Total responses to Reasons why Respondents felt Justice was served*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police helped to recover stolen/lost property/helped victims to get some form of compensation from the perpetrators</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perpetrators were arrested by police, taken to court and charged</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perpetrators were caught and killed by the police</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perpetrators were forgiven by the victims/police and advised to cease from such activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator moved from that area and relocated to other place</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 56 responses were given as to why justice was not served upon reporting to police, as shown in the table below; the main reason being that the police did not conduct proper investigations.
Table 8: Responses on why Respondents felt Justice was not Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police did not conduct proper investigations or they were bribed/compromised by the perpetrators or their families.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lost property was not recovered, so the victims gave up on the cases</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police were the perpetrators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cases are still on-going in the courts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perpetrator died, so the cases did not go on.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The death of the victim resulted to family loss with no one to help follow up of the cases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 126 who did not report to the police, 59 said they believed nothing would happen if you report; 34 felt that there is no justice for the poor; 25 said police do not investigate well, 18 felt it can cause problems in the community/at home; 16 for fear of repercussions from the perpetrator or other victimisation. Just 11 did not report to police because they had recourse i.e. they reported to elders and village committees.

### 5.3 Assistance to Access Justice

66 respondents received assistance to access justice. In 30 cases, family members or neighbours, in 12 cases the chief or community leaders, in nine cases paralegals, and in seven cases community policing/Nyumba Kumi Initiative offered assistance for victims to access justice.

Table 9: Organizations, Institutions or Groups that supported Respondent or family member to Access Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor/Family</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief or community leaders</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing/Nyumba Kumi Initiative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Security guards, work groups)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main forms of assistance were: accompaniment to police station (27); emotional comfort (25); access to medical assistance and counselling (14); access to alternative dispute resolution (9); and transport to a health facility and access to legal aid (7) each. Most of the respondents who received these forms of support felt that these contributed to resolving the issues (41 out of the 50 who answered the question). However, their rating when asked whether justice was served was low (18 out of 52 who answered the question). We shall return to this finding in the next chapter.
5.4 Summary and discussion

Family members featured prominently with regard to those who provide immediate support to victims, including access to justice, as opposed to neighbours and civil society actors. This suggests that paralegals and other civil society actors do not play a key role in the immediate response to violence incidences in the survey area, but the first point of contact in cases of distress is family and neighbours. One explanation to this surprising finding is that respondents know paralegals and the services that they provide but do not necessarily link them with any organisation. That said, paralegals still feature more than NGOs and it raises questions to the effectiveness of civil society organisations in providing immediate assistance or supporting victims in accessing justice.

A second key finding is that though victims of violence get some immediate assistance, some support in reporting, and report some cases to various levels of government including the police, only few incidences of violence are resolved. Most of the cases reported to the police, local leaders and the chief are not addressed to the satisfaction of the victims. The support and assistance by family members, paralegals and neighbours is mainly emotional support, accompaniment to police station, and access to medical assistance and counselling, but not prosecution of the perpetrator, reconciliation and making amends, recovery of stolen property or assurances of non-repetition of violence. This suggests a very precarious life for the people in a slum setting such as South Eastleigh.

Thirdly, many respondents mentioned lack of protection from perpetrators - whether individuals, gangs, or police – as a critical aspect in their justice seeking behaviour; in fact, protection from further violence could be more important than seeking justice for the violence that had taken place. It would be relevant to interrogate further the coping mechanisms of the residents in a qualitative study.
6. EVERYDAY VIOLENCE AMONGST THE URBAN POOR

Violence is part of the daily life in Nairobi Eastlands and as law enforcement agents constitute one of every four perpetrators, the survey results affirm the idea of looking into ‘everyday violence’ amongst the urban poor and the need for the documentation of torture and ill-treatment to turn to the streets, the market places, and the homes of slum dwellers.

This chapter takes the data analysis one step further through a brief discussion of key issues and identification of recommendations for the national government, including policing initiatives, and for civil society actors, especially human rights organisations.

6.1 High Violence, Low Trust, and Community Policing

The high levels of violence around one’s home and low trust between neighbours play out in many ways, from not leaving laundry on the line and trusting neighbours to look after one’s children to avoiding interaction with the people who live literally next door. Other practices are to hide away one’s suffering such as hunger or pretend that all is well while knowing about domestic violence next door (Hovmoeller 2016). Such avoidance, hiding, and pretending is a feature of neighbourliness in a slum. It may seem surprising considering the proximity of neighbours - one can hear, smell, and follow the lives of the neighbours through the thin walls separating the houses - yet that is the very point: living right next door creates a ‘compelled intimacy’ where people must get along even if they don’t trust them (Jensen and Hapal 2015). At times only the neighbours can help searching for your stolen property, at the same time you suspect that one of them is the thief or colluded with the thieves.

We propose that the ambiguous sentiments between neighbours have implications for people’s views on communal action such as community policing. Critical voices towards the most recent government community policing initiative, Nyumba Kumi, tend to focus on political aspects such as fear that information is used to punish political opponents or hinder mobilisation for the next elections or police-citizen relations, or poor police-citizen relations. Nyumba Kumi is located in the Office of the President. It was introduced right after the 2013 elections and is based on clusters of ‘neighbourhood watch’ that report to the chief (lowest authority of the government structure). Three years down the line, the initiative has little to show as crime rate continues to soar, mainly attributed to the public of view the police with suspicion when it comes to volunteering information. Community policing is part of a reform in the National Police Service, which seeks to improve citizen-police relations through vetting of police officers and the introduction of new standing orders, amongst other.

Poor citizen-police relation is a main obstacle for community-policing initiatives in Kenya, yet we argue that poor relations between neighbours must also be addressed in violence prevention in slum areas. This is particularly important in places like South Eastleigh where neighbourly relations are marked by low trust, low interaction in social associations, and an everyday practice to conceal problems and belongings, and where people are frequently robbed or attacked within their home by ‘outsiders’ who are known to them.

That said, the relations between neighbours in terms of safety is closely connected to citizen-police relations, as the lack of safety within one’s home and the knowledge that some of the neighbours pose a threat to one’s family safety is aggravated when the perpetrators are protected by the police or the community policing leaders.
**Recommendations:**

- Relations between neighbours must be addressed as part of trying to improve the positive impact of community policing initiatives.

- Policing initiatives like community policing and Nyumba Kumi must address the fact that most violence is perpetrated at household level by people in the neighbourhood.

### 6.2 Police: Reducing Crime – Creating Criminals

People in South Eastleigh view police officers as protectors and perpetrators. Viewed as ‘protectors’, 60% of the respondents said that they would report violence to the police and almost 40% of the victims of violence did report to the police. The police attended to most (77.9%) of the cases reported yet less than half (43.4%) of the respondents thought that the police response had led to a resolution in terms of investigation, identification of suspects, arrest or settlement. In three cases, the police killed the suspect.

While most people accepted that a police arrest involves threats, intimidation, kicks, slaps, punches, and whipping, and they did not regard these actions as ‘police use of violence’ – the respondents generally did not justify police use of violence; instead police officers would be seen as ‘perpetrators’. Yet, it is a muddy picture with differences between many respondents’ general view on police use of violence in relation to suspects and concrete examples. Whereas the respondents generally do not justify the use of violence regardless of the guilt, innocence or age of the person, many respondents praised a particular police officer who had brought down the high rate of violence and crime in 2014 through killing a number of young men ‘engaged in crime’. This was done with the consent of the Chief, and the community members had been made aware. However, many relatives, especially mothers who had lost a son, took a different position: the police claimed that their sons were criminals but they were innocent ‘boys’ – not criminals, victims of extra-judicial killings. Amongst the youth there emerged a sense that their fellow peers killed during that time were ‘our fallen soldiers’ and they started writing their names – or nicknames – on the wall of a primary school to informally commemorate them.
It was certainly not only in relation to reducing crime that the police use violence. In fact, extortion by the police was deemed as ‘normal’ by most of the respondents. They would use the Swahili term *Kawaida* to express that it is expected behaviour and the very term ‘extortion’ was associated with the police. Interestingly, extortion is associated with the police and robbery with organized groups. One woman said that if she had to choose between running into the police on her way home or taking a turn into a road where she would be robbed by a gang, she would choose the latter, because if she didn’t have the bribe that the police were asking for, she would be arrested, spend the night in jail, be accused of a crime she didn’t commit and be arraigned in court the following day. This is a time consuming punishment and she could risk losing her job. If she ran into robbers, she would have a chance to show up to work the following day even if they took her money.

In addition to extortion, people told about experiences of threats, intimidation and unlawful arrests by police officers. There is a marked difference whether the police is seen as a ‘protector’ to bring about justice for a crime committed by a neighbour (68% reported cases with the neighbour as the suspect) or the police is involved as a perpetrator (only 22% of the victims reported the case to the police). In the latter cases, people said that ‘you cannot report the police to the police’ as it could increase the insecurity of the entire family.

These discussions testify to the prevalence of state violence in South Eastleigh. Considering that 42% of the respondents captured in the survey (245 out of 500) were victims of violence and the police is the perpetrator of 25.5% of this violence, it means a *victimization rate of 10% to police violence*. This figure is alarmingly high and shows the great vulnerability of the urban poor to state violence in Nairobi.

**Recommendations:**

- Policing initiatives must consider independent complaint and oversight mechanisms at community level to ensure compliance with the law and reduce the involvement of law enforcement agencies and actors in the perpetration of violence.

- *Address the every day violence amongst the urban poor*

- *Change attitudes* amongst the urban poor towards acceptance of police use of violence in terms of threats, intimidation, kicks, slaps, punches, and whipping.

- *Generate research-based* knowledge on the dynamics of vulnerability to violence amongst the urban poor; and establish the links between extortion and violence in poor urban neighborhoods.

### 6.3 Moving Beyond Human Rights Organisations

The lack of access to immediate assistance, justice and rehabilitation for the urban poor in South Eastleigh is a cause of great concern. 152 respondents (69%) did not receive any form of assistance! Out of the 66 respondents who received assistance, family members and neighbours were the key actors (they gave almost half of the assistance) and the chief or community leaders assisting in 12 cases. Although paralegals assisted 9 victims and they are often seen as ‘neighbours’ rather than ‘paralegals’, there is a remarkable absence of civil society organisations to aid victims of violence in this poor urban setting.

This finding must be understood against the background that the mapping of human rights organisations’ ‘people on the ground’ in low-income settlements in Nairobi City Council showed that there was at least one paralegal organisation in South Eastleigh. In fact, their presence was a key reason for selecting that particular survey site. It is therefore all the more surprising that paralegals and other civil society organisations play such a little role on the ground.

Moving beyond the fact that most victims did not receive any immediate assistance or access to justice and rehabilitation, it is relevant to look into the assistance provided by relatives, neighbours, chiefs and community leaders: accompaniment to police station (27); emotional comfort (25); access to medical
assistance and counselling (14); access to alternative dispute resolution (9); and transport to a health facility and access to legal aid (7). Close to all these respondents felt that the assistance had contributed to resolving their issues yet only one third thought that justice had been served.

The scant presence of human rights organisations ‘on the ground’ in Nairobi slums, encourages human rights actors to consider new forms of collaboration with civil society actors who are present on the ground as well as more use of technology to better capture and respond to violence on the ground.

**Recommendations:**

- Enhance collaboration between human rights organisations with mandate to address violence and non-human rights organisations ‘on the ground’ to: i) raise awareness on provisions regarding law enforcement and the conduct of Law Enforcement Agents, ii) improve documentation, and iii) strengthen the mechanisms for protection of vulnerable members from violence.

- Use technology to such as mobile phone technology better capture and respond to violence on the ground.

- Human rights organisations should recognize victims’ interest in protection.
7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey set out to explore the vulnerability of poor urban residents in Nairobi to state violence and with a focus on the importance of social support structures and paralegal organisations. Based on a survey with 500 randomly selected respondents above 18 years of age, this study report has established that there is an overall vulnerability of 10% to state violence in South Eastleigh location - during the past one year, one out of ten survey respondents had been victim to police violence.

This alarmingly high vulnerability to state violence is aggravated by poor access to immediate assistance, rehabilitation, and justice. This situation is partly due to low trust between neighbours and low associational life and support amongst the survey respondents and partly due to low presence of human rights-oriented actors.

This survey is part of a larger research project on the documentation of torture and ill-treatment in Nairobi City County, and the results have encouraged us to take two further steps:

1) We are in the final stage of the development of a mobile phone App that will allow any Kenyan (with an Android phone) to record incidences of violence and we can soon launch the coalition of human rights organisations that will respond to the reported incidences. We anticipate that this will greatly enhance the access to justice and rehabilitation for the urban poor, including in South Eastleigh Location.

2) We have embarked on a further study on the safety or protection mechanisms at the local level i.e. in South Eastleigh Location in order to gain a better understanding of the protection options, practices, and needs. The findings will feed into a wider endeavor to link human rights work with protection of the common victim of crime and violence.

An overview of the key findings

- High level of violence: 25% respondents informed about their own experience
- The household is the most common scene of violence
- Organized groups and police are the main perpetrators
- Most common forms of violence: robbery, beating, threats
- Most injuries are cuts and bruises by physical strength, objects, and weapons
- More common to report violence by organized groups than police violence
- Low levels of sense that justice was served
- Low levels of trust and participation in associational life
- Low levels of awareness about where to access legal and medical support
- Victims want protection - organizations provide legal aid and rehabilitation

Recommendations

A) National government policing initiatives:

- Policing initiatives like community policing and Nyumba Kumi must address that most violence is perpetrated at household level by people in the neighbourhood.

- Policing initiatives must consider independent complaint and oversight mechanisms at community level to ensure compliance with the law and reduce the involvement of law enforcement agencies and actors in the perpetration of violence.
B) Government and civil society organisations:

- Address the every day violence amongst the urban poor

- Change attitudes amongst the urban poor towards acceptance of police use of violence in terms of threats, intimidation, kicks, slaps, punches, and whipping.

- Improve reporting behaviour to include ‘minor’ injuries from criminal gangs

- Generate research-based knowledge on the dynamics of vulnerability to violence amongst the urban poor; and the link between extortion and violence in poor urban neighborhoods.

C) Civil society organisations:

- Human rights organisations should recognize victims’ interest in protection

- Explore collaboration between human rights organisations with mandate to address violence and organisations ‘on the ground’ to: i) raise awareness on provisions regarding law enforcement and the conduct of LEAs, ii) improve documentation, and iii) strengthen the mechanisms for protection of vulnerable members from violence.
8. APPENDICES

8.1: Questionnaire

Informed consent

Good morning/afternoon/evening, my name is ______________. I am working with IMLU as a research assistant. IMLU supports victims of violence through provision of legal, medical and psychosocial services and advocacy for policy, legal and institutional reforms. IMLU is conducting a survey aiming at producing knowledge on the perceptions and experiences of violence and the factors that may lead to (under)reporting in poor urban areas. The research report will go towards IMLU’s support to the County Policing Authorities.

We would appreciate if you could answer a few questions. The information you provide will be kept confidential and respondents will not be directly identified. Are you above 18 years of age? Please tell us if you are willing to continue with the interview.' The interview will take about 30 minutes.

Identification Particulars (IP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP1. Interview No: ..................................</th>
<th>IP2. Date of Interview (Day/Month/Year): ..................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP3. Village: 1=Mugunda  2=Kinyago  3=Kanuku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Details (SD)

SD 1. Name of Interviewer:

1. [ ] Hannah Njoroge
2. [ ] Derrick Kasamani
3. [ ] Joyce Wango
4. [ ] Victor Otieno Odero
5. [ ] Simon Maveke

SD 2. Interview status

1 = Interview completed;  2 = Postponed;  3 = Refused;  4 = Other (Specify) .................

Section 1: Demographic Information of the respondent

DI 1. Status within the household

1. Man/Father
2. Woman/Mother
3. Daughter
4. Son
5. Relative
6. Other(Friend/Househelp)

DI 2. Are you the head of the household? 1. [ ] Yes 2. [ ] No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI 3. Gender</th>
<th>DI 4. Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI 5. Marital status</th>
<th>DI 6. Education level <em>(Tick the highest attended)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI 7. What is your main source of income</th>
<th>DI 8. If employed or self employed, what is your nature of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI 9. What is the average monthly income of the household in KES</th>
<th>DI 10. How long has your family lived in this neighbourhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ☐ = Less than 5,000 2. ☐ = 6,000-15,000 3. ☐ = 16,000-25,000 4. ☐ = Beyond 26,000 5. ☐ = Don’t know</td>
<td>1. ☐ = Less than one year 2. ☐ = 2-5 years 3. ☐ = 6-10 years 4. ☐ = 11-20 years 5. ☐ = More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI 11. Is the house where your family lives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section 2: About Trust And Community

This Section will ask questions on how people participate in community and social life in your areas:

TC 1. In the last one year have you been an active member of any group/association in your community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(If No, skip to TC 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC 2. Which of the following types of groups in your community have you been an active member during the past one year (more than one answer is possible)?

1. Men/Women’s groups (Chamas)
2. Work related organisations (e.g. trade unions, hawker/vendor associations)
3. Religious groups (e.g. Catholic, Anglican, Muslim)
4. Political groups
5. Cooperatives/credit/lending associations
6. Community/people’s/Youth organisations (e.g. funeral groups, income generating groups)
7. Community policing (Nyumba kumi, Vigilantes’)
8. NGO/CBOs
9. None
10. Other, specify.................

TC 3. In the last one year have you received social or financial support from any of the following (several answers are possible)

1. Men/Women’s groups
2. Work related organisations (e.g. trade unions, hawker/vendor associations)
3. Religious organization (e.g. Catholic, Anglican, Muslim)
4. Political groups
5. Cooperatives/credit/lending associations
6. Paralegal organisations
7. Community/people’s organisations Youth organisations (e.g. funeral groups, income generating groups)
8. Community policing (Nyumba kumi, Vigilantes’)
9. NGO/CBOs
10. None
11. Other, specify.................

TC 4. In the last year have you gained access to social or financial support through referral or information from any of the following individuals? (Multiple response)

1. Family/relatives
2. Neighbours
3. Friends who are not neighbours
4. Community leaders (e.g. religious leaders, politicians, businessmen)
5. Government officials (e.g. chiefs, police)
6. Leaders of charitable organisations/NGOs/CBOs
7. Paralegals
8. None
9. Others (specify)......................
**TC 5.** In the last year have you participated with other community members to address a common problem or issue in the community?

1. Yes
2. No

**TC 6.** In the last year have you reported a problem in this community to any of the following (more than one answer is possible)

1. Government officials
2. Community leaders
3. CBOs
4. None

**TC 7.** How much do you trust the majority of the people in this ‘mtaa’? (E.g. confidence to get support, not to snatch my phone, take care of my children)

1. Very much
2. Much
3. Not so much
4. Not at all

**TC 8.** The next questions are sentences that the person you interview must finish when you have given him or her options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=With no difficulty</th>
<th>2=With little difficulty</th>
<th>3=With some difficulty</th>
<th>4=With much difficulty</th>
<th>5=With absolute difficulty (Impossible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to participate in and maintain my family relations...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am able to participate in work or education...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to participate in community and social life...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to participate in political life...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3: Experience with Violence**

In the following we would like to ask you questions about what you think about violence in your community. When we say violence we mean threats or use of physical force by neighbours, youth, police or local authorities. Do you know what I mean? (Get the respondent to explain. If the respondent does not understand, please give examples)

**EWV 1.** How often do the following kinds of violence occur in your ‘mtaa’?

Tick only those mentioned below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= Less often</th>
<th>2= Often</th>
<th>3= Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fighting(Kupigana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Threats/intimidation/harassment (incl. unlawful arrest, detention, gun on your head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Beating(Kupigwa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extortion(Kutoanishwa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Killing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sexual violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shooting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EWV 2. Who are the most frequent perpetrators of violence in your community (only one answer)**

1. □ Spouse/parent/relative (domestic sphere/household)
2. □ Organized groups
3. □ Police
4. □ Local administration
5. □ Others, (specify) ...................................................

**EWV 3. In your perception, where do the perpetrators of violence in your community come from? (Multiple response)**

1. □ Within your near neighbourhood/mtaa
2. □ Within your location/Village
3. □ Outside your location/Village

**EWV 4. How do you rate the efforts to solve the problem of violence by the following leaders and authorities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= Very effective</th>
<th>2= Effective</th>
<th>3= Moderately effective</th>
<th>4= Ineffective</th>
<th>5= Very ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community leaders</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local authorities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. County government</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National government</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EWV 5. Do you think there is more violence in your neighbourhood/mtaa now compared to 2013? (Single response)**

1. □ Yes
2. □ No
3. □ Same
4. □ Don’t know

**EWV 6. Have you or any member of your household experienced any event of violence since 2013?**

1. □ Yes
2. □ No

*If No, skip to section 7*

**EWV 7. Which event of violence did you or that member of your household suffer since 2013? (Family member affected) ......................**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3=Perpetrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Thief/ Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Stranger/Unknown assailant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= Within the household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2= In the neighbourhood (Mtaani)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Fighting | □ |
| 2. Threat  | □ |
| 3. Beating | □ |
| 4. Killing | □ |
| 5. Sexual violence | □ |
| 6. Robbery | □ |
| 7. Shooting | □ |
| 8. None   | □ |
| 9. Others; specify | □ |
EWV 8. Which events of violence did member of your household suffer since 2013?

(1) Within the household
(2) In the neighbourhood (Mtaani)

1. Fighting
2. Threat
3. Beating
4. Killings
5. Sexual violence
6. Robbery
7. Shooting
8. None
9. Others; specify

EWV 9. Which events of violence did member of your household suffer since 2013?

(1) Within the household
(2) In the neighbourhood (Mtaani)

1. Fighting
2. Threat
3. Beating
4. Killings
5. Sexual violence
6. Robbery
7. Shooting
8. Others; specify

Section 4: Effects of Violence/Damages

(Refer to the incidents listed in section 3, question number 6)

EoV 1. Did you or any family member - exposed to violence - suffer from any physical injuries?

1 = Yes
2 = No. Skip to question No. EoV 4

EoV 2. Which kind of physical injuries did they inflict upon you or your family member (more than one answer is possible)?

(Maximum 3 family members)

1 = Bullet wound
2 = Cuts/bruises
3 = Burns
4 = Loss of limbs/sight/reproductive ability/Chronic pain/Numbness
5 = Paralysis
6 = Death
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### EoV 3. The injuries were caused by (more than one answer possible)
1. Fire arms
2. Sharp pointed weapon (e.g. Pangas, Somali swords, Daggers, Bicycle spokes)
3. Physical strength (e.g. rape, defilement, beating, Head butt, Ngeta)
4. Hard/blunt objects (e.g. hammer, piece of metal, wooden object)
5. Cigarettes and other hot objects
6. Pulling, twisting, squeezing or hanging
7. Others (specify)

### EoV 4. Did the incidence affect you or the member of your family in terms of?
(\textbf{socio-economic effect of violence}) more than one answer possible

1. Material and financial damages
2. Emotional strains
3. Damage to family and social relations
4. Don’t know

### EoV 5. Did you or the family member stop working or study because of the incident?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

### Section 5: Assistance at the time of the Incidents
\textit{(reference to the incidents listed in Section 3, question number EWV 6)}

1. Family
2. Police
3. Chief
4. Private security (security guard/watchman)
5. Paralegals
6. Neighbours
7. Guardians
8. Community policing/Nyumba kumi Initiative
9. Vigilante group
10. None
11. Other

### Section 6: Reporting and Justice

#### RJ 1. Did you or any family members report any of the incidents to the police?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

If Yes, go to question RJ 2, if No or Don’t know, go to question RJ 9

#### RJ 2. Did the police give attention to the complaint?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

#### RJ 3. Did the complaint lead to any form of resolution?

1. Yes
2. No

#### RJ 4. If Yes above (question 3), how was it achieved? ..........................................................................................................................
RJ 5. If No in Question 3, what was the reason why the case was not resolved? .................................................

RJ 6. Do you think that justice was served?  
1. Yes, if Yes, answer RJ 7, then skip to RJ 10.  
2. No

RJ 7. If Yes above, why? .........................................................................................................................

RJ 8. If No in RJ 6 above, why? After you answer this question, skip to RJ 10.  
............................................................................................................................................................

RJ 9. What were the reasons why you did not report to the police?  
(Multiple response)  
1. They do not investigate well  
2. They do not understand the law  
3. There is no justice for the poor  
4. It can cause problems in the community/at home  
5. Nothing will happen even if you report  
6. People can pay their way out of jail  
7. We use other mechanisms (elders, village committee, etc)  
8. Fear of victimization  
9. Other, specify..........................................................

RJ 10. Which organizations, institutions or groups supported you or your family member to access justice?  
(Multiple response)  
1. Neighbour or family  
2. Community organization (e.g. church, women groups)  
3. NGOs  
4. Chief or community leaders  
5. Community policing/Nyumba kumi Initiative  
6. Paralegals  
7. Politician  
8. Media  
9. None  
10. Others (please name).................................  
11. Don't know

RJ 11. Which assistance did these organisations provide?  
(Multiple response)  
1. Accompanied to the police station  
2. Medical documentation  
3. Access to Legal aid  
4. Taken witness statements  
5. Transport to a health facility  
6. Access to medical treatment/Counselling  
7. Access to Alternative Dispute Resolution  
8. Emotional comfort

RJ 12. Did the assistance lead to any form of resolution?  
1. Yes  
2. No

RJ 13. If yes above, how was it achieved? ..............................................................................................

RJ 14. If No in question 12, what was the reason why the case was not resolved?  
............................................................................................................................................................

RJ 15. Do you think that justice was served?  
1. Yes  
2. No

*Violence amongst the urban poor in Nairobi*
### Section 7: Perceptions of the use of Violence

*We would like to hear your opinion on the following scenarios;*

| PV 1. If the police catch a minor who is suspected of having committed a crime, is it okay for the police to use violence on them? | 1. [ ] Yes, specify.............................................  
2. [ ] No, specify............................................. |
| PV 2. If the police catch a minor who is guilty of a crime, is it okay for the police to use violence on them? | 1. [ ] Yes, specify.............................................  
2. [ ] No, specify............................................. |
| PV 3. If the police catch an adult who is suspected of having committed a crime, is it okay for the police to use violence on them? | 1. [ ] Yes, specify.............................................  
2. [ ] No, specify............................................. |
| PV 4. If the police catch an adult who is guilty of a crime, is it okay for the police to use violence on them? | 1. [ ] Yes, specify.............................................  
2. [ ] No, specify............................................. |

### Section 8: General Awareness and Reporting

| GAR 1. Where would you report a case of violence  
(Multiple response) | 1. [ ] Family  
2. [ ] Police  
3. [ ] Chief  
4. [ ] Private security (security guard/watchman)  
5. [ ] NGOs/Paralegals  
6. [ ] Neighbours  
7. [ ] Guardians  
8. [ ] Community policing/Nyumba kumi Initiative  
9. [ ] Vigilante group  
10. [ ] Other |
| GAR 2. Which NGOs/CBOs/FBOs/Paralegals do you know of that you can go and report cases of violence? | ................................................................. |
| GAR 3. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us that could help end violence in the community? | ................................................................. |

THANK YOU FOR CONTRIBUTING TO THIS SURVEY.
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