

# Identifying Thresholds of Harm Kenya

---

This document explains and seeks to justify how we decided on whether an individual or a household is in serious harm not, based on questionnaire answers. This requires an explanation of the local view, obtained from focus groups across sites, but also of an expert view which at times helped inform the combinations of answers that lead to us identifying one as in serious harm or not.

## Economic Security

### 3.1) Economic security

3.1.1) Would you together with other household members be able to get ..... Ksh in one week if you really needed it?? *[include average of monthly food expenditure; mention borrowing from friends, family or bank]*

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.1.2) How would you raise the money?

Response:
-----------

3.1.3) *[IF **savings** is not mentioned]* Are you able to access savings?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.1.4) *[IF **borrowing** is not mentioned]* Are you able to borrow money?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Two sets of indicators that were linked to those in serious harm were mentioned throughout the Kenyan focus groups: issues of casual or non-permanent income and those which had no access to savings.

We therefore concluded that if 3.1.1 is No, and that the household would not be able to get a small amount of money in times of need, then they would be in serious harm.

## Sanitation

### 3.2 Sanitation

3.2.1) Does this HH have access to toilet facilities?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.2.2) *[IF 'yes']* If yes what type of toilet facility do members of your HH normally use?

1) Bush toilet	2) Flying toilet	3) Pit latrine	4) Public toilet
5) Private toilet	Other:		

3.2.2a) *[IF 'no' Ask where they go to help themselves]*

Pit latrines were consistently mentioned as those doing OK (or badly) but those in serious harm were considered to be those with bush toilets or flying toilets.

Therefore if 3.2.2 is a bush or flying toilet then one is in serious harm.

## Drinking Water

### 3.3 Drinking water

3.3.1) What is the main source of drinking water for this HH?

1) unprotected well	2) river	3) lake
4) rain water tank	5) borehole	6) public tap
7) private tap	8) Other:	

3.3.2) Do you treat drinking water?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Three main issues came up as being associated with being in serious harm: the quality of the water (safe to drink), distance to collection and difficulty in extraction of water and water from a borehole (which is not always available).

It is difficult to judge who is in harm or not as we are unsure of the quality of the water at each site.

Those that use any water, that use water that is also used by other animals, that use muddy water or water from shallow wells were specifically mentioned as being in serious harm at all sites therefore I would argue that:

You are in serious harm if you do not treat the drinking water (3.3.2 = 0) and your main source of drinking water is an unprotected well, a river or a lake.

## Food Security

### 3.4) Food security

3.4.1) Over the past year, have you or anyone in the HH been restricted to only one meal because you did not have food?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.4.2) How often do members of this HH eat only once because they do not have enough food?

1) Never	2) Several times a year
3) Once or twice a month	4) Once a week or more

There seems to be two issues closely associated with being in serious harm. One is the quality of the food, and the other is the amount.

In terms of quality, this is mostly relevant for those doing OK but not in serious harm.

In terms of amount of food, no meals, only one meal a day or little amounts of food are all considered to be linked to those in serious harm.

If someone has only eaten one meal several times within the last year (just once may be due to illness, bad weather....) one could consider this person to be in serious harm.

**If 3.4.1 is Yes and 3.4.2. is 2, 3, 4 then you are in serious harm.**

## Health

### 3.5 Health

3.5.1) Over the past **year**, did **you** or **any** member of the HH suffered ill health?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.5.2) Who suffered the ill health?

Name:	Name:
-------	-------

3.5.3) Were/was . . . *[name of the person ]* **able** to access **sufficient** medical care?

1) Yes	2) Some	0) No
--------	---------	-------

3.5.4) Over the **past year**, did you or any member of the HH suffered **injury**?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.5.5) Who suffered injury?

Name:	Name:
-------	-------

3.5.6) Were you able to access sufficient medical care?

1) Yes	2) Some	0) No
--------	---------	-------

3.5.7) Have you or anyone of the HH been able to use traditional medicine over the past twelve months?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Two main issues are brought up which highlight individuals that are in serious harm or close to harm. Firstly those that rely solely on free services provided by the government are thought of as doing badly and those that buy or get medicine without going to hospital are thought of as being in serious harm.

Those that only go to hospital when they are in critical conditions are those in serious harm. These are those that get drugs prescribed by friends or pharmacy rather than going to hospital. It is again an issue of access as some have chosen not to go to hospital probably because they have to work or it is too expensive and only want to go if absolutely necessary.

Therefore if someone has suffered ill health or injury but was not able to access sufficient medical care (e.g. if 3.5.1 is 1 and 3.5.3 is 0 or if 3.5.4 is 1 and 3.5.6 is 0) then they are in serious harm

## Education

### 3.6 Education

3.6.1) Do your children at time miss school time?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.6.2) [IF 'yes'] How often do your children miss school time?

0) Never	1) Several times a year
2) Once or twice a month	3) Once a week or more

3.6.3) Why do they miss school time?

Reason:
---------

Two main issues arise from the focus groups. Firstly the ability to pay tuition fees and necessary school expenditures and attendance or interest from children or parents. Low attendance would reflect interest and expenses and hence is a good measure to go by.

Children spending most time at home, dropping out of school (such as at standard 8) are often linked to those being in serious harm.

Therefore those children that missed school once a week or more were in serious harm (if 3.6.2 = 3).

## Physical Security

### 3.7 Physical security

3.7.1) Do you feel physically secure in your village?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.7.2) Do you feel physically secure in your home?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.7.3) Over the past year, has any member of your HH been attacked?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Questions regarding physical security in Kenya were misunderstood. Those doing "well" were those with more money and those that were more scared of their surroundings and felt less secure. Whilst those poorer individuals had no fear and needed no security.

Those doing well, needed doors with locks, cctv, weapons, security lights, many friends etc... to feel safe.

Therefore in this case, the important questions would be whether one feels secure in the village and in the home.

Therefore if one does not feel secure in the village or the house or whether they have been attacked, one is considered to be in serious harm (if 3.7.1 = 0 or 3.7.2 = 0 or 3.7.3 = 1)

**If 3.7.1. is NO OR 3.7.2. is NO then you are in serious harm.**

There is a case for saying that those well off, who don't feel secure in the village but feel secure in their homes are not in serious harm...This is up for debate but better to set the threshold of harm higher rather than lower to make sure we are more inclusive.

## Respect

### 3.8 Respect

3.8.1) Do people come to you for advice on problems or for help?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.8.2) Are you a member of any group?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

3.8.3) Do you have any position in any group?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Little respect from others and in particular from the family were deemed as being very important. Without this respect one is deemed to be in serious harm at all sites.

The questions above will not help us elucidate whether one is in serious harm or not as it does not let us see if the individual is respected by others or especially by his family.

It might be best to consider the autonomy questions as to whether the individual is involved in making decisions or not. If not, it may be that his or her opinions and thoughts are not respected.

## Relationships

### 3.9 Relationships

3.9.1) Outside the immediate family, how many other HHs in this community would you describe as being very good friends to your HH?

0) None	1) Hardly any
2) Quite a few	3) Many

3.9.2) Do you feel that you have people to turn to for help when you need it?

1) Yes	0) No
--------	-------

Two issues were deemed important, one is the quality and/or number of friendships one has within the community and the other (arguably more important) was the amount of support one can receive.

Living in isolation was mentioned in Tsunza as being linked to being in serious harm. Fights in the community and bad relationships with wife/husband were also mentioned. The above questions won't necessarily link to this issue however.

However, support was deemed very important and close to the threshold of harm for all sites.

Therefore if one has nobody to turn to in times of need then they are in serious harm (if 3.9.2 = 0)

## Autonomy

### 10 Autonomy

3.10.1) If there is a **decision** to be made in your wider **community**, are you **involved** in that decision?

0) Never	1) Sometimes	2) Always
----------	--------------	-----------

3.10.2) If there is a **decision** to be made at your **place of work**, are you **involved** in that decision?

0) Never	1) Sometimes	2) Always
----------	--------------	-----------

3.10.3) If a decision is to be made within the **HH**, are you **involved** in that decision?

1) Never	2) Sometimes	3) Always
----------	--------------	-----------

Two aspects were mentioned, one was regarding dependence on the government or other richer individuals, the other was about ones' ability to make decisions.

Those not asked for advice, whose decisions are ignored are considered close to or as being in serious harm. We could therefore argue that:

If one is above 18 and answers Never to 3.10.1, 3.10.2 and 3.10.3 then he is in serious harm

## Participation

Those in serious harm at all sites are those not invited or involved to ceremonies or parties.

Given that there are no questions relating to this in the questionnaire it will be hard to identify thresholds of harm for this.

# Shelter

## 11. Household characteristics

Dwelling type	Wall material
1) House    2) Room 3) Other:	1) Palm leaf    2) Mud    3) Mud with cement    4) Block    5) Other:
Roof material	Floor
1) Palm leaf    2) Tiles    3) Iron 4) Other:	1) Soil    2) Cement    3) Tiles    4) Galana    5) Wood    6) Other:

11.1) Do you own or rent this house / room?

11.2) Do you have electricity in your house / room?

11.2) [IF 'yes'] What is your main source of the electricit?

11.3) What is your main source of lighting?

11.4) What do you normally use for cooking?

Ownership	Electricity
1) Own    2) Rent 3) Other:	1) None    2) Car battery    3) Electricity    4) Solar    5) generator    6) Other:
Lighting	Cooking
1) None    2) Candle    3) Kerosene wick    4) Lantern    5) firewood    6) bulb 7) Other:	1) Firewood    2) Charcoal    3) Kerosene    4) Gas    5) Electricity    6) Other:

11.5) Which of the following items do you or any household member own?

5.1) Friji: Yes    No	5.10) Pikipiki: Yes    No	5.19) Land: _____ acres
5.2) Jenereta/sola: Yes    No	5.11) Tuktuku: Yes    No	5.20) Ng'ombe: _____ [number]
5.3) Runinga: Yes    No	5.12) Gari/ Trakta: Yes    No	5.21) Kondoo: _____ [number]
5.4) Video / DVD: Yes    No	5.13) Dau: Yes    No	5.22) Mbuzi: _____ [number]
5.5) Dishi: Yes    No	5.14) Ngalawa: Yes    No	5.23) Kuku: _____ [number]
5.6) Feni ya umeme: Yes    No	5.15) Jahazi: Yes    No	5.24) Bata: _____ [number]
5.7) Simu ya mkoo: Yes    No	5.16) Jembe: Yes    No	
5.8) Redio: Yes    No	5.17) Panga: Yes    No	
5.9) Baiskeli: Yes    No	5.18) Jembe lang'ombe: Yes    No	

Mud floor and Makuti thatch were regularly associated with those close to being in serious harm. Similarly to Mozambique there are issues of privacy as many have mentioned lack of windows (being able to see through) being linked to those in serious harm.

Those with leaking roofs and not being able to re-thatch are in serious harm. Similarly to Mozambique this means that it is the lack of ability to repair the house rather than what the house is made of. Questions were not asked on ability to repair thatch roofs and therefore we could not use this to identify whether someone was in serious harm or not.

Similarly, whilst a mud floor was considered at times to be linked to those in serious harm. For some, a mud floor consists of sand which was not considered a serious issue and therefore we could not use mud floor as an indicator of harm.



We therefore decided that those with thatch walls were in serious harm, due to privacy issues, but identifies those at risk during bad weather.