

Impact of COVID-19 on the On-going Refugees Economic Inclusion in Kenya: Difference-in-Differences Analysis

Serge B. Hounton¹, Dulo Nyaoro²

¹Master of Arts Student in Forced Migration Moi University, Kenya

²Peace Institute Coordinator Moi University, Kenya

Abstract: This paper examines how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the refugee's livelihood and the on-going economic inclusion in Kenya. We analyse the impact of the pandemic on various refugee settlements such as, Kalobeyi Settlement, and urban areas in the host country compared to the formal camps (Kakuma and Dadaab), Kenya. By doing so, we use the Difference-in-Differences evaluation analysis to assess the impact of the pandemic on the refugee's livelihood (refugees' income) and the economic inclusion (relief services). We use data collected by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) from May to July 2020 in Kenya to empirically analyse the effect of COVID-19 on the refugees. Our findings show that the refugees in the Kalobeyi settlement and urban areas livelihoods have been negatively and significantly affected than the refugees in the formal camps, Kakuma and Dadaab. Moreover, our analysis reveals that the pandemic has increased the aid dependency of Kalobeyi and urban refugees in Kenya. That means the COVID-19 has negatively impacted on-going refugees' economic inclusion in Kenya.

Keywords: COVID-19, Economic Inclusion, Refugee's livelihoods, Refugee Settlements, Difference-in-Differences

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

The global pandemic of COVID-19 has adversely affected most people around the world. However, for refugees in developing countries it has been double tragedy because of their vulnerable situation. As of 31st December 2020, Kenya hosts more than 504,854 registered Refugees and Asylum-Seekers which makes it the third largest refugees hosting country in Africa (UNHCR, 2020b). These refugees are mainly hosted in designated camps or in urban areas in Kenya. These are Dadaab camp in the North East which hosts about 44 percent of the refugees, the Kakuma camp in the North West which hosts about 40 percent and the rest (16 percent) which is hosted in the urban area of Nairobi.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR, 2020c) the vulnerable populations, particularly refugees and asylum-seekers, have a lot of challenges to meet their basic needs due to the slow-down of global and national economies. The COVID-19 pandemic has negatively affected their access to jobs and livelihood choices. Refugees are generally vulnerable, and with the blow of the

COVID-19 pandemic, they seem to be hard hit by the pandemic's economic and social impact (Dempster et al., 2020a). Moreover, the measures taken by the host countries of refugees have adversely affected the refugees' livelihoods within these borders. To understand how the refugees' economic inclusion has been affected by the pandemic in Kenya, we ask and answer the following question: *Has COVID-19 increased the aid received by the refugees in Kalobeyi settlement and urban areas?* This question allows us to analyse how COVID-19 has increased refugees' dependency in Kenya and has slowed down the on-going economic inclusion.

In addition, refugees in the developing countries have difficulty in accessing the formal job market and the majority of them end up in the informal sector. Dempster et al. (2020), found out that the outbreak of COVID-19 has greatly affected the refugees in the informal sector; many informal sector workers as well as refugees in the developing countries have suffered job loss as their job security is not guaranteed. Due to the lockdown measures put in place by the governments around the world because of COVID-19 outbreak, about 1.6 billion informal economy workers such as refugees have suffered massive damage to their capacity to earn a living to sustain their household (ILO, 2020). Therefore, we analyse how the refugees' income has been affected by COVID-19 outbreak in Kenya by asking the following question: *Have the refugees in Kalobeyi and urban areas income been negatively affected compared to the refugees in Kakuma and Dadaab camps?* This question helps us to appreciate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on the on-going refugees' economic inclusion in the host country, Kenya.

To be able to answer the aforementioned questions empirically, we use data collected by the UNHCR-Kenya (2020a), in collaboration with the World Bank, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and University of California. The data has been collected from May to July 2020 over phone among the refugees in Kakuma, Kalobeyi, and Dadaab and Urban areas. Our empirical model is inspired by the difference-in-differences impact evaluation method of analysis econometrics framework (Hanck et al., 2019). The findings reveal that the COVID-19 outbreak has negatively affected the on-going refugees' economic inclusion in the host

countries, Kenya. Due to the outbreak the refugees in Kalobeyi settlement and urban areas have lost their sources of income such as salary. In average the salary earned by the refugees in Kalobeyi settlement and urban areas is less than the salary earned by the refugees in Kakuma and Dadaab camps. Nevertheless, this COVID-19 outbreak has significantly increased the aid towards refugees in those settlements. Therefore, the pandemic has significantly increased their level of dependency in the host country, Kenya.

1.2. Literature Review

The rapid spread of COVID-19 pandemic around the world has shown us the way we are all equal as human beings. The pandemic has proved that all human beings are vulnerable in terms of health and well-being. In the face of the pandemic we are all the same and we all have the same weaknesses no matter how powerful we are. Meanwhile, “displaced populations, including refugees and migrants, are often the first to be stigmatized and unjustly blamed for the spread of disease, yet they are also among the most vulnerable people during a pandemic to both the virus itself and the measures enacted to control it by the host government in developing countries” (Lau et al., 2020).

Dempster et al. (2020), argue on how economic inclusion can benefit refugees, refugee-hosting nations, and the host populations. They recommend various measures that significantly impact refugees' short and long-term income and livelihood. Refugees living in countries with low income are more vulnerable to the negative impacts of COVID-19. They used statistics from eight countries to show that refugees from those host nations are 60 percent more likely to work in impacted sectors. Those sectors include the housing, food facilities, manufacturing, and the retailing sector. They also analyse how COVID-19 has increased poverty among refugees. The security of refugees, the labour market, and all help that was initially provided by humanitarian agencies has been greatly withdrawn during the pandemic. Going onward, as refugee hosting nations encounter an imminent monetary downturn, increasing joblessness, and growing prejudice, there will be increased distrust of refugees' economic inclusion. In line with their argument we also find that the on-going refugees' economic inclusion has been distrusted by the pandemic. Our findings revealed that the refugees in the inclusion process have lost their income more than the refugees in the normal camps. Moreover, the pandemic has significantly increased their aid dependency. Therefore, they were more self-dependent before the pandemic outbreak, that means the International agents came to their rescue to donate them some reliefs so that they would be able to sustain themselves during the restriction of movement and lockdown.

According to Finsterwalder et al. (2020), the host countries should better include and integrate refugees and their resources, should improve their individual well-being, reduce social tensions in the host countries, increase overall host

community well-being and productivity. Our findings are also in the same dynamic with this recommendation so that refugees in the host developing countries such as Kenya will not be affected by a similar pandemic in the future to avoid increasing their dependency on aid.

Bukuluki et al. (2020), examine the socio-cultural, economic and psychosocial effect of the COVID-19 on urban refugees in Uganda. They point out that the lockdown has affected refugee livelihoods and augmented income lost, sexual and gender-based violence and anxiety. We also find out income lost from our analysis but we have not analysed the impact of the pandemic on gender-based violence in Kenya among refugees. Therefore, Braam et al. (2021), point out the important socio-economic determinants affected by the COVID-19 outbreak among the conflicts affected population in Somalia; such as livelihoods, remittances and household income.

Mulu (2021) conducted their research on the Congolese refugees in South Africa and the findings revealed that COVID-19 pandemic has greatly amplified existing inequalities experienced by female Congolese asylum seekers, and in the process, creating new ones. They pointed out that there was a significant increase in asylum-seeking and refugee women's care roles in homes due to the containment measures imposed by the South African government in an attempt to curb the spread of the virus. Those who had paid work were rendered more precarious. Depending on their demographic and socio-economic status, nature of employment, educational level or entrepreneurial activity, and their residency status in South Africa, the resilience strategies adopted by those women during the pandemic varied. According to the study, those refugees and asylum-seeking women engaged in survivalist businesses stood a greater risk of facing extreme poverty and malnutrition, irrespective of their marital status, compared to those employed in the formal economy. Our findings confirm what this study has revealed, that, urban female refugees in Kenya are generally in the informal sector because of lack of jobs in the formal sector. The concentration of refugees in highly impacted sectors maybe as a result of limited economic inclusion or restrictive laws pushing refugees to work in specific industries. Refugees are more likely to work in the informal sector which is expected to be hit harder by the pandemic (Dempster et al., 2020b).

1.3. Literature Review

The rapid spread of COVID-19 pandemic around the world has shown us the way we are all equal as human beings. The pandemic has proved that all human beings are vulnerable in terms of health and well-being. In the face of the pandemic we are all the same and we all have the same weaknesses no matter how powerful we are. Meanwhile, “displaced populations, including refugees and migrants, are often the first to be stigmatized and unjustly blamed for the spread of disease, yet they are also among the most vulnerable people during a pandemic to both the virus itself and the measures

enacted to control it by the host government in developing countries” (Lau et al., 2020).

Dempster et al. (2020), argue on how economic inclusion can benefit refugees, refugee-hosting nations, and the host populations. They recommend various measures that significantly impact refugees' short and long-term income and livelihood. Refugees living in countries with low income are more vulnerable to the negative impacts of COVID-19. They used statistics from eight countries to show that refugees from those host nations are 60 percent more likely to work in impacted sectors. Those sectors include the housing, food facilities, manufacturing, and the retailing sector. They also analyse how COVID-19 has increased poverty among refugees. The security of refugees, the labour market, and all help that was initially provided by humanitarian agencies has been greatly withdrawn during the pandemic. Going onward, as refugee hosting nations encounter an imminent monetary downturn, increasing joblessness, and growing prejudice, there will be increased distrust of refugees' economic inclusion. In line with their argument we also find that the ongoing refugees' economic inclusion has been distrusted by the pandemic. Our findings revealed that the refugees in the inclusion process have lost their income more than the refugees in the normal camps. Moreover, the pandemic has significantly increased their aid dependency. Therefore, they were more self-dependent before the pandemic outbreak, that means the International agents came to their rescue to donate them some reliefs so that they would be able to sustain themselves during the restriction of movement and lockdown.

According to Finsterwalder et al. (2020), the host countries should better include and integrate refugees and their resources, should improve their individual well-being, reduce social tensions in the host countries, increase overall host community well-being and productivity. Our findings are also in the same dynamic with this recommendation so that refugees in the host developing countries such as Kenya will not be affected by a similar pandemic in the future to avoid increasing their dependency on aid.

Bukuluki et al. (2020), examine the socio-cultural, economic and psychosocial effect of the COVID-19 on urban refugees in Uganda. They point out that the lockdown has affected refugee livelihoods and augmented income lost, sexual and gender-based violence and anxiety. We also find out income lost from our analysis but we have not analysed the impact of the pandemic on gender-based violence in Kenya among refugees. Therefore, Braam et al. (2021), point out the important socio-economic determinants affected by the COVID-19 outbreak among the conflicts affected population in Somalia; such as livelihoods, remittances and household income.

Mulu (2021) conducted their research on the Congolese refugees in South Africa and the findings revealed that COVID-19 pandemic has greatly amplified existing inequalities experienced by female Congolese asylum seekers,

and in the process, creating new ones. They pointed out that there was a significant increase in asylum-seeking and refugee women's care roles in homes due to the containment measures imposed by the South African government in an attempt to curb the spread of the virus. Those who had paid work were rendered more precarious. Depending on their demographic and socio-economic status, nature of employment, educational level or entrepreneurial activity, and their residency status in South Africa, the resilience strategies adopted by those women during the pandemic varied. According to the study, those refugees and asylum-seeking women engaged in survivalist businesses stood a greater risk of facing extreme poverty and malnutrition, irrespective of their marital status, compared to those employed in the formal economy. Our findings confirm what this study has revealed, that, urban female refugees in Kenya are generally in the informal sector because of lack of jobs in the formal sector. The concentration of refugees in highly impacted sectors maybe as a result of limited economic inclusion or restrictive laws pushing refugees to work in specific industries. Refugees are more likely to work in the informal sector which is expected to be hit harder by the pandemic (Dempster et al., 2020b).

1.4. *Refugees in Kenya*

Article 1(A)(2) of the 1951 Geneva Convention defines a refugee as “an individual who is outside his or her country of nationality or habitual residence who is unable or unwilling to return due to a well-founded fear of persecution based on his or her race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group”.

As of 31 May 2021, Kenya was hosting about 519,989 Registered Refugees and Asylum-Seekers (UNHCR, 2021). Therefore, Kenya is currently the third largest refugees hosting country in Africa after Uganda and Ethiopia. Meanwhile, 44 percent of those refugees are hosted in Dadaab Camp in North East of Kenya; 40 percent reside in Kakuma Camp in North West of Kenya and the remainder of sixteen percent reside in urban areas of the country such as Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru and Eldoret Majority of these refugees are from neighbouring countries such as (Somalia, South Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Burundi, Sudan, Uganda, Eritrea, and Rwanda). The majority (50 percent) are from Somalia, followed by South Sudan (24.6 percent). The Congolese refugees are 9 percent and the Refugees from Ethiopia are 5.8 percent. The combination of refugees from Burundi, Sudan, Uganda, Eritrea, Rwanda and the rest is 7 percent of the total refugees' hosted by Kenya (UNHCR, 2021).

In terms of gender, the males constitute the majority (51 percent) and the female are 49 percent. Therefore, the children aged between 0 and 17 are in majority by holding 53 percent; those who aged between 18 and 59 are 44 percent in the country and the elders are just 3 percent (UNHCR, 2021). Overall, only 11 percent of the forced displaced in Kenya are

Asylum-Seekers and the huge numbers of them (89 percent) hold Refugees Status.

1.3.1 Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kalobeyei Integrated Settlement

According to UNHCR Kenya (2021), Kakuma Camp is divided into four namely, Kakuma one, two, three and four while Kalobeyei Settlement comprises of three villages, Village one, two and three. Kakuma refugee camp is located in the North-western region of Kenya. The camp was established in 1992 following the arrival of the “Lost Boys of Sudan”. During that year, large groups of Ethiopian refugees fled their country following the fall of the Ethiopian government. Somalia had also experienced high insecurity and civil strife causing people to flee (UNHCR Kenya, 2021b).

Kalobeyei camp is located to the northwest part of Kakuma camp which is 40 km away in the Turkana County. In 2015, the UNHCR and the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of the Kenya agreed upon the construction of the Kalobeyei Settlement Scheme which was launched on 14th of December, 2018. So that, the settlement would make the refugees and host communities self-reliable by providing them with better livelihood opportunities and enhanced service delivery. The World Bank collaborated with UNHCR to form a “Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan” to help in developing local economy and service delivery at Kalobeyei. The new approach was developed around the “Choice Theory” to allow refugees and the host population to maximize their potential in an enabling environment. The theory has two main building blocks which inform the overall goal of “Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan” (UNHCR Kenya, 2020). Firstly, it aims to create an enabling environment, in which inclusive service delivery and local capacities are strengthened, legal frameworks and policies are improved, a conducive environment for investment and job creation is promoted and communities’ resilience is strengthened. It also aims to build people’s skills and capabilities to successfully function in this new environment and to enhance the overall local economy (UNHCR Kenya, 2020). Therefore, the main objective for the construction of the Kalobeyei settlement was to improve socio-economic lives of refugees and the host community (UNHCR Kenya, 2020). Second is to help refugees reduce their over-dependence on humanitarian aids. The “Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan” was set to achieve the above mentioned objectives through various components which include education, health, private sector and entrepreneurship, energy and more (UNHCR Kenya, 2017).

The implementation of “Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan” follows a three-phase approach with a preparatory stage in 2016-2017 followed by Phase I (2018-2022), Phase II (2023-2027) and Phase III (2028-2030) (UNHCR Kenya, 2020).

1.3.2 Dadaab Refugee Complex

Dadaab refugee complex is composed of three camps; these are “Dagahaley, Ifo and Hagadera”. The first two are located in Lagdera in Dadaab District while Hagadera is located in the neighbouring Fafi District. A large part of the residents in the old camps (Ifo, Dagahaley, Hagadera) arrived in Dadaab in the 1990s and have children and grandchildren born in the camps (UNHCR Kenya, 2021a). The camps resemble naturally-grown towns and have developed into commercial hubs connecting north-eastern Kenya and southern Somalia. During the Horn of Africa famine in 2011, two camps, “Ifo 2” and “Kambioos” were established to cater for the influx. These two camps have, however, been closed with the reduction of the numbers in Dadaab as a result of the voluntary return programme (UNHCR Kenya, 2021a).

II. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Data

To be able to analyse our empirical results, this paper used the data collected by the United Nations Higher Commissioner for Refugees (UNCHR) Kenya, in collaboration with the World Bank, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and University of California. They randomly selected 1000 individuals of 18 years of age and above with active phone numbers from UNHCR database for four camp sites which include: Kakuma, Kalobeyei, Dadaab and Urban. They used everyone in the sample for the Shona site, due to the small sample size of the Shona population (782). Short Message Services (SMS) were sent to the individuals selected from each site mentioning that they had been randomly selected to participate in a socio-economic impact of COVID-19 survey. Out of the individuals who were delivered the SMS, 250 individuals were selected from each site for the survey giving a sum of 3,529 individuals. The survey has been conducted from May to July 2020 by using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI). The questionnaire included 12 sections namely: Introduction, Household background, Travel patterns and interactions, Employment, Food security, Income Loss, Transfers, Subjective welfare, Health, COVID Knowledge, Household and Social Relations and Conclusion.

The data is a micro data host by the United Nations Higher Commissioner for Refugee (UNHCR) as a private data. Therefore, before getting the data we submitted a request to the UNHCR and they gave us the data requesting to understand the purpose of the data usage from us.

2.2. Identification Strategy

Our identification strategy has been inspired by the difference-in-differences analysis method (Hanck et al., 2019). We constructed our difference-in-difference (*DiD*) estimated by given a two-period setting where (*t*) is the time variable defined as:

$$t = \{t = 0, \text{Before COVID19} = 1, \text{After COVID19}$$

And letting $Y_t^T = Y_t(1)$ as the outcome of the COVID-19 effect on the treated refugee settlements, and $Y_t^C = Y_t(0)$ as the outcome of the non-treated refugee settlements, both in the respective (t) time period.

Our *DiD* estimator seeks to measure

$$DiD = E((Y_1^T - Y_0^T)/T = 1) - E((Y_1^C - Y_0^C)/T = 0) \quad (1)$$

The estimator (*DiD*) measures the expected outcomes in a post and pre COVID-19 outbreak impacts on the treated relative of the expected outcomes of the non-treated settlements. We used COVID-19 as the first treatment for all the settlements, and the second treatment is the Kalobeyei settlement and the urban areas, and the camps are the control groups. Moreover, we compared Kalobeyei settlement with the two camps (Kakuma and Dadaab) and then compared the urban area with the two camps.

2.3. Empirical Strategy

We consider the following basic difference-in-difference model to be able to estimate our empirical strategy.

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T + \beta_2 t + \beta_3 t * T + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

Where T stands for the treatment groups, our treatment groups here are Kalobeyei settlement and urban areas and the control groups are Kakuma camp and Dadaab camp. Y_i stands for the average outcome of COVID-19 impact on refugee's livelihoods. Meanwhile t represents the time period of COVID-19 outbreak from February to May, 2020. ε_i is the error term and $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ are the estimators.

From the aforementioned equation (2), we specify the equations according to each treatment group and control as well.

$$Salary_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Kal_{Kak} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_1 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (3)$$

$Salary_i$ is the salary of the refugee (i) received in February before COVID-19 outbreak and in May after COVID-19 outbreak. Kal_{Kak} is the treatment group where Kalobeyei settlement is the treatment and takes 1 as value, and Kakuma is the control group and takes 0 as value. $COVID19$ represents the time period (February to May) of the outbreak and takes the value 1 and 0 otherwise. X_i is the covariate such as age, gender, education level etc.

$$Aid_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Kal_{Kak} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_1 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (4)$$

Where Aid_i is the aid received by the refugee (i) before and after the COVID-19 outbreak in the Kalobeyei settlement and Kakuma camp.

$$Salary_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Kal_{Dab} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_2 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (5)$$

$$Aid_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Kal_{Dab} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_2 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (6)$$

Kal_{Dab} is the treatment group where Kalobeyei Settlement is the treatment and takes 1 as value, and Dadaab is the control group and takes 0 otherwise.

The following equations represent the specification for the urban areas as well as Kakuma and Dadaab camps.

$$Salary_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Urban_{Kak} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_3 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (7)$$

$$Aid_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Urban_{Kak} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_3 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (8)$$

$Urban_{Kak}$ is the treatment group where Urban area is the treatment and takes 1 as value, and Kakuma camp is the control group and takes 0 otherwise.

$$Salary_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Urban_{Dab} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_4 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (9)$$

$$Aid_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Urban_{Dab} + \beta_2 COVID19 + \beta_3 DiD_4 + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (10)$$

$Urban_{Dab}$ is the treatment group where Urban area is the treatment and takes 1 as value, and Dadaab Camp is the control group and takes 0 otherwise.

III. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1. COVID-19 and Income in Kalobeyei Settlement and Kakuma Camp

Table 1 below shows our first analysis of the COVID-19 shocks on the Kalobeyei Settlement compared to Kakuma Camp from February to May 2020. The result of the difference-in-differences regression revealed that the salary (income) of the refugees settled in Kalobeyei have been negatively affected by the COVID-19 outbreak over time. The refugees in Kalobeyei Settlement salary has been negatively impacted than the refugees in Kakuma Camp. But this result is not statistically significant, this may be due to the fact that the refugees in the Kakuma Camp depend more on aid than the refugees in the Kalobeyei Settlement. Moreover, COVID-19 outbreak affected the salary (income) of the refugees in the Kalobeyei settlement negatively over time and statistically significant at 10 percent confidence level. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a wide-spread loss of livelihoods among refugee populations resulting in reduced self-reliance and increased concerns on protection (Dempster et al., 2020b).

Golesorkhi et al. (2020), also pointed out in gender perspective that, Refugee women's livelihoods have been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in various specific ways, such as losing jobs and income. Furthermore, they mentioned that the impacts have been informed by restricted access to resources and services, lack of information about resources and services, and paramount fear due to ever-changing policy. Bhagat et al. (2020), mentioned in their policy paper that Corona virus outbreak led to a loss of livelihood for those who either work on short term contracts or those who are without any job contracts. This includes

several jobs in different industries such as in tourism industry, guide, and employees of parking contractors, cleaners, waiters in restaurants, suppliers of vegetables and flowers to the hotels and so on (Dempster et al., 2020a).

Table 1: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Salary, Kalobeyei Settlement and Kakuma Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary
Kal_Kak	326.5 (387.7)	325.2 (384.8)	473.0 (571.2)	464.7 (596.0)	360.2 (581.2)	355.5 (583.0)	344.4 (659.2)	55.30 (667.8)	29.34 (669.3)
COVID19		-666.2* (382.2)	-549.9 (506.8)	-675.8 (540.8)	-657.5 (526.4)	-643.9 (528.5)	-773.0 (619.5)	-813.6 (623.1)	-822.6 (624.0)
DiDI			-272.0 (775.0)	-188.0 (811.0)	-170.0 (789.3)	-178.9 (791.8)	-83.51 (892.2)	-59.87 (889.5)	-71.45 (890.7)
Age of respondent				-5.688 (113.0)	-51.98 (111.2)	-33.28 (116.8)	-5.571 (142.3)	-5.408 (140.7)	-20.74 (142.0)
Gender of respondent					-1,286*** (458.3)	-1,224** (473.5)	-1,056 (664.7)	-1,034 (658.1)	-801.7 (711.9)
Highest Level of Education						86.27 (160.3)	110.5 (184.0)	171.7 (186.2)	203.1 (189.9)
Country of Birth or Origin							96.81 (133.8)	84.79 (133.6)	67.90 (135.2)
Remittance Received								1,133 (974.2)	1,279 (990.1)
Aid Received									-521.8 (605.9)
Constant	2,988*** (253.5)	3,350*** (326.5)	3,287*** (373.9)	3,405*** (546.3)	5,195*** (830.7)	4,574*** (1,424)	3,752** (1,724)	1,323 (2,852)	1,308 (2,856)
Observations	138	138	138	128	128	128	112	110	110
R-squared	0.005	0.027	0.028	0.034	0.093	0.095	0.071	0.087	0.094
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

2. COVID-19 and Aid received in Kalobeyei Settlement and Kakuma Camp

Table 2 below shows that because of COVID-19 outbreak, the Aid towards refugees in Kalobeyei settlement has increased from February to May. This is because they did not rely much on aid as the refugees in Kakuma camp. But the difference-in-differences revealed that the Aid received in the Kalobeyei settlement is less than the Aid received in Kakuma camp. Therefore, this result is not statistically significant. This may be due the fact that the refugees in Kalobeyei are self-reliance than the refugees in Kakuma camp.

Betts et al. (2021) pointed out that because of Ccovid-19 outbreak humanitarian organisations have struggled to respond effectively to the needs of refugees, and Refugees Lead Organisations have frequently found themselves as default providers of assistance and mutual aid, but usually without additional or effective support from international organisations and NGOs. These

findings lie within our result because of the fact that the refugees in Kalobeyei have more refugees lead organisations that provide for themselves.

Table 2: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Aid, Kalobeyei and Kakuma Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid
Kal_Kak	-98.63	-92.54	-86.20	-66.64	-53.58	-53.58	-41.18	-47.56	-46.25
	(83.54)	(80.77)	(82.00)	(78.66)	(78.88)	(78.94)	(88.15)	(83.03)	(83.11)
COVID19		1,581***	1,663***	1,684***	1,674***	1,674***	1,792***	1,788***	1,631***
		(233.6)	(294.4)	(270.4)	(269.9)	(270.7)	(309.9)	(291.6)	(381.5)
DiD1			-221.1	317.6	264.5	264.1	609.3	178.9	205.6
			(484.4)	(496.6)	(496.6)	(498.8)	(578.4)	(546.9)	(548.8)
Age of respondent				-21.27	-19.92	-19.86	-14.86	-18.13	-17.32
				(19.08)	(19.06)	(19.92)	(23.10)	(21.75)	(21.80)
Gender of respondent					137.3*	137.6*	174.2*	150.6*	146.1*
					(78.16)	(82.26)	(92.90)	(87.52)	(87.85)
Highest Level of Education						0.219	1.609	-0.223	-0.224
						(21.93)	(24.71)	(23.26)	(23.27)
Country of Birth or Origin							13.89	7.485	6.618
							(23.11)	(21.77)	(21.83)
Remittance Received								1,114***	1,116***
								(134.6)	(134.7)
Aid Received									90.35
									(141.7)
Constant	238.3***	189.2***	186.6***	240.6***	39.79	38.21	-92.50	-2,341***	-2,433***
	(52.81)	(51.57)	(51.90)	(81.76)	(140.4)	(212.5)	(261.7)	(366.8)	(394.2)
Observations	643	643	643	588	588	588	524	523	523
R-squared	0.002	0.069	0.069	0.100	0.104	0.104	0.116	0.220	0.220
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

3. COVID-19 and Income in Kalobeyei Settlement and Dadaab Camp

Table 3 below shows that the salary of the refugees in Kalobeyei settlement in average is reduced more than the salary of the refugees in the Dadaab camp because of the COVID-19 outbreak. This may be due to the fact that the refugees in the Kalobeyei settlement rely more on their own salary than the refugees in the Dadaab camp. Moreover, Refugees in Dadaab camp who work with international organisations are incentive workers, which mean they continue receiving their income during the lockdown and the remote workers too. Meanwhile, UNHCR “announced the first two cases of COVID-19 in Dadaab in May and has worked with other humanitarian groups and the Kenyan government to enhance the response in the camps. Thanks to the COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund, UNHCR and its partners have stepped up their efforts, working together to protect the health and wellbeing of the 217,515 refugees and asylum-seekers living in the Dadaab refugee camps” (Alaoui, 2020).

Table 3: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Salary, Kalobeyei and Dadaab Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary
Kal_Dab	266.3 (481.4)	286.6 (481.7)	768.8 (692.3)	905.2 (707.7)	810.5 (681.3)	543.7 (708.5)	233.5 (793.8)	248.6 (796.7)	197.3 (791.0)
COVID19		-478.3 (464.6)	113.5 (766.9)	185.2 (788.1)	203.4 (757.8)	180.2 (754.8)	201.7 (795.7)	234.7 (799.7)	349.4 (797.0)
DiD2			-935.4 (964.1)	-1,086 (986.8)	-1,063 (948.8)	-1,030 (945.1)	-1,065 (993.6)	-1,109 (999.0)	-1,250 (995.4)
Age of respondent				-258.4* (135.2)	-331.1** (132.6)	-294.2** (135.0)	-329.3** (143.1)	-332.4** (143.6)	-309.7** (143.3)
Gender of respondent					-1,557*** (555.4)	-1,372** (570.9)	-1,459** (635.7)	-1,412** (641.4)	-1,192* (653.0)
Highest Level of Education						223.1 (170.7)	221.9 (178.3)	226.9 (179.1)	250.9 (178.4)
Country of Birth or Origin							172.9 (167.8)	185.4 (169.3)	192.4 (168.0)
Remittance Received								487.8 (695.1)	814.5 (723.4)
Aid Received									-754.1 (505.6)
Constant	3,048*** (383.5)	3,287*** (448.2)	2,991*** (542.3)	3,800*** (720.0)	5,992*** (1,044)	4,646*** (1,464)	4,420*** (1,556)	3,238 (2,297)	2,940 (2,287)
Observations	93	93	93	89	89	89	84	84	84
R-squared	0.003	0.015	0.025	0.071	0.152	0.169	0.186	0.192	0.215
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

4. COVID-19 and Aid in Kalobeyi Settlement and Dadaab Camp

Table 4 below shows that the COVID-19 outbreak has increased the aid received by the refugees in the Kalobeyi settlement over the time period of February to May. But that aid is less than the aid received by the refugees in the Dadaab camp. The second result is statistically insignificant.

Table 4: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Aid, Kalobeyi and Dadaab Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid
Kal_Dab	-319.4** (125.9)	-210.8* (119.2)	-167.7 (121.9)	-236.4* (133.5)	-265.8** (135.2)	-269.7** (135.5)	-165.9 (139.8)	-212.1* (124.3)	-207.3* (125.3)

COVID19		1,997***	2,340***	2,523***	2,500***	2,510***	1,836***	1,413***	1,332***
		(270.9)	(343.9)	(372.1)	(372.1)	(373.1)	(346.7)	(311.5)	(393.7)
DiD2			-898.0	-556.4	-453.3	-482.1	665.7	423.2	429.2
			(556.5)	(651.4)	(655.3)	(658.6)	(639.1)	(568.6)	(569.7)
Age of respondent				-63.53**	-63.91**	-59.41*	-20.85	-4.275	-4.876
				(29.09)	(29.06)	(30.51)	(29.68)	(26.44)	(26.54)
Gender of respondent					-170.9	-151.7	-69.24	-52.68	-54.65
					(127.9)	(133.9)	(128.0)	(113.8)	(114.1)
Highest Level of Education						16.54	5.349	4.852	4.798
						(33.77)	(31.64)	(28.12)	(28.16)
Country of Birth or Origin							15.41	17.26	16.54
							(38.47)	(34.19)	(34.30)
Remittance Received								1,669***	1,670***
								(179.3)	(179.5)
Aid Received									51.40
									(152.8)
Constant	459.1***	296.1***	268.1***	554.5***	813.2***	696.3**	340.0	-3,193***	-3,244***
	(100.4)	(96.91)	(98.26)	(160.2)	(251.2)	(346.7)	(347.8)	(489.5)	(513.1)
Observations	404	404	404	367	367	367	330	330	330
R-squared	0.016	0.133	0.139	0.163	0.167	0.168	0.145	0.327	0.327
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

5. COVID-19 and Income in Urban area and Kakuma Camp

The COVID-19 outbreak over the time period of February to May has negatively impacted the urban refugees’ salary (income); this result is statistically significant at 5 percent confidence level when there are no control variables added (Table5). Diff-in-Diff regression result shows that the urban refugees’ salary in average has been negatively affected than the refugees in the Kakuma camp. This is due to the fact that refugees in Kakuma camp rely more on aid from the international organisations than the urban refugees. They also receive income as incentive workers from the international organisations such as UNHCR and its partners.

Household livelihood has been significantly affected due to decreased income resulting from a slowdown in economic activities, decreased work hours and limited economic opportunities due to COVID-19 in urban areas (UNICEF Kenya, 2020).

Table5: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Salary, Urban area and Kakuma Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary
Urban_Kak	800.1*	777.7*	1,494**	1,770**	1,772**	1,887***	1,411*	1,345*	1,508*
	(457.2)	(448.4)	(653.3)	(699.6)	(703.0)	(687.3)	(752.1)	(781.1)	(779.6)
COVID19		-1,137**	-549.9	-662.7	-662.3	-592.5	-745.7	-785.0	-803.7
		(445.8)	(591.5)	(629.6)	(632.3)	(617.5)	(702.4)	(715.4)	(708.7)
DiD3			-1,343	-1,244	-1,244	-1,305	-1,204	-1,151	-1,125

			(894.7)	(961.7)	(965.8)	(942.5)	(1,020)	(1,030)	(1,020)
Age of respondent				180.7	179.7	276.7*	444.1**	427.7**	323.4*
				(140.5)	(142.5)	(143.8)	(171.8)	(178.7)	(187.3)
Gender of respondent					-27.10	129.0	876.7	792.8	776.3
					(520.7)	(511.4)	(619.8)	(637.3)	(631.4)
Highest Level of Education						424.4***	492.0***	491.9***	436.8**
						(160.6)	(174.3)	(176.4)	(177.7)
Country of Birth or Origin							93.03	62.73	13.67
							(154.3)	(155.5)	(156.7)
Remittance Received								-190.4	-586.9
								(958.0)	(977.1)
Aid Received									-885.4*
									(520.0)
Constant	2,988***	3,607***	3,287***	2,784***	2,821***	-67.05	-1,980	-1,155	1,541
	(301.8)	(382.7)	(436.4)	(656.9)	(982.8)	(1,454)	(1,914)	(3,078)	(3,435)
Observations	140	140	140	124	124	124	110	108	108
R-squared	0.022	0.066	0.081	0.108	0.108	0.158	0.185	0.185	0.208
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

6. COVID-19 and Aid in Urban area and Kakuma Camp

The outbreak of COVID-19 has increased the aid received by the urban Refugees over the time period from February to May. This result is statistically significant at 1 percent confidence level. The diff-in-Diff (DiD3) result shows that the aid received in average by the urban refugees is greater than the aid received by the refugees in Kakuma camp (table6). This is due to the fact that a lot of international organisations came in to help the urban refugees because of their vulnerable situation that had become worse the pandemic and the restriction measures put in place by the host country. The COVID-19 outbreak has slowdown the process of urban refugees’ economic inclusion in the host community in Nairobi.

Table 6: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Aid, Urban area and Kakuma Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid
Urban_Kak	507.2***	303.3*	211.7	159.2	149.7	146.8	175.7	116.9	69.97
	(165.7)	(158.5)	(162.0)	(154.4)	(154.5)	(156.3)	(174.4)	(171.9)	(174.3)
COVID19		2,997***	1,663***	1,676***	1,690***	1,694***	1,902***	1,894***	1,397**
		(325.4)	(618.0)	(557.4)	(557.2)	(558.6)	(643.0)	(631.7)	(706.2)
DiD3			1,840**	1,424**	1,372**	1,370**	1,115	954.2	1,038
			(725.8)	(663.6)	(664.4)	(665.1)	(749.3)	(736.8)	(737.9)
Age of respondent				60.13*	59.57	60.41	74.25*	66.74	66.99
				(36.32)	(36.30)	(36.91)	(41.85)	(41.14)	(41.09)
Gender of respondent					-201.2	-196.0	-187.3	-198.3	-182.6
					(152.1)	(157.6)	(177.5)	(174.4)	(174.5)

Highest Level of Education						5.286	8.588	5.538	11.53
						(40.74)	(45.83)	(45.04)	(45.14)
Country of Birth or Origin							-7.141	-22.12	-22.62
							(41.19)	(40.58)	(40.53)
Remittance Received								1,188***	1,178***
								(247.2)	(247.0)
Aid Received									285.0
									(181.9)
Constant	238.3**	145.2	186.6*	-36.36	253.0	217.7	191.7	-2,171***	-2,498***
	(113.7)	(108.1)	(109.0)	(160.5)	(271.3)	(384.7)	(470.7)	(675.1)	(705.8)
Observations	729	729	729	656	656	656	591	590	590
R-squared	0.013	0.116	0.124	0.128	0.130	0.130	0.130	0.163	0.167
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

7. COVID-19 and Income in Urban area and Dadaab Camp

Over the time period of February to May 2020, the salary of the urban refugees has been negatively affected by the COVID-19 outbreak. The salary of the refugees in the urban areas has been reduced in average more than the refugees in Dadaab camp (table7). This is similar to the previous findings, due to the fact that, more refugees work for international organisations in the Camp, but those in the urban areas have been restricted to from but the urban have been restricted from working in Nairobi because the COVID-19 restriction measures put in place by the government of Kenya.

Table 7: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Salary, Urban area and Dadaab Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary	Salary
UrbanDab	739.9	768.7	1,790**	2,101**	2,078**	1,587*	857.9	878.4	1,121
	(610.8)	(600.8)	(848.9)	(910.9)	(915.7)	(887.2)	(1,171)	(1,174)	(1,156)
COVID19		-1,174**	113.5	124.8	119.9	63.33	50.37	15.74	152.9
		(576.4)	(953.2)	(1,004)	(1,009)	(960.8)	(1,011)	(1,014)	(995.5)
DiD4			-2,007*	-2,044	-2,047	-1,980	-2,044	-1,978	-2,110*
			(1,190)	(1,272)	(1,277)	(1,217)	(1,270)	(1,275)	(1,251)
Age of respondent				-16.82	2.915	93.11	151.2	106.4	86.34
				(190.7)	(194.8)	(187.9)	(209.7)	(216.6)	(212.4)
Gender of respondent					379.0	544.9	697.2	528.9	460.0
					(679.6)	(649.6)	(682.5)	(711.8)	(698.2)
Highest Level of Education						544.3***	569.7***	570.4***	520.7***
						(180.4)	(188.9)	(189.2)	(187.0)
Country of Birth or Origin							243.6	226.7	170.1
							(240.3)	(241.5)	(238.3)
Remittance Received								-697.8	-699.9

								(819.9)	(803.2)
Aid Received									-964.4**
									(479.0)
Constant	3,048***	3,635***	2,991***	2,985***	2,444*	-482.5	-1,733	222.1	1,931
	(489.4)	(561.0)	(674.0)	(957.8)	(1,365)	(1,622)	(2,127)	(3,134)	(3,186)
Observations	95	95	95	85	85	85	82	82	82
R-squared	0.016	0.058	0.087	0.101	0.104	0.198	0.208	0.216	0.258
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

8. COVID-19 and Aid in Urban area and Dadaab Camp

Due to COVID-19 outbreak, the aid towards the urban refugees has been significantly increased over the time period of February to May 2020. Moreover, the average aid received by the urban refugees is greater than the average aid received by the refugees in Dadaab camp (table8). This result is due to the restriction and lockdown; the urban refugees were not allowed excess to work places. Then the international organisations came in to support them by donating in cash or kind that they would be able to sustain their household.

Table 8: Difference-in-Difference Regression on Aid, Urban area and Dadaab Camp

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid	Aid
Urban_Dab	286.4 (265.2)	230.5 (249.1)	130.2 (260.4)	73.38 (257.6)	-3.688 (257.0)	-28.87 (262.6)	175.7 (300.1)	95.03 (293.5)	71.77 (294.8)
COVID19		3,195*** (391.4)	2,340*** (760.4)	2,410*** (739.6)	2,315*** (734.5)	2,335*** (736.4)	1,632** (782.8)	1,255 (768.8)	968.6 (836.7)
DiD4			1,163 (886.7)	692.7 (862.1)	664.1 (855.3)	653.3 (856.4)	1,318 (899.7)	1,476* (879.0)	1,490* (879.5)
Age of respondent				53.47 (51.84)	57.14 (51.45)	60.90 (52.09)	99.00* (55.85)	101.1* (54.53)	97.68* (54.69)
Gender of respondent					-649.5*** (230.6)	-623.6*** (237.1)	-583.8** (255.3)	-549.9** (249.3)	-528.0** (250.7)
Highest Level of Education						27.57 (57.73)	15.54 (61.59)	9.085 (60.15)	14.74 (60.52)
Country of Birth or Origin							-28.03 (63.88)	-49.16 (62.53)	-48.53 (62.56)
Remittance Received								1,549*** (344.7)	1,537*** (345.1)
Aid Received									191.0 (219.8)
Constant	459.1** (221.9)	198.3 (210.8)	268.1 (217.3)	72.26 (300.6)	1,034** (453.3)	863.9 (576.8)	707.4 (648.3)	-2,451*** (945.9)	-2,684*** (983.5)

Observations	490	490	490	435	435	435	397	397	397
R-squared	0.002	0.122	0.126	0.126	0.142	0.142	0.141	0.183	0.185
Control	No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard errors in parentheses									
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1									

III. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our analysis and findings from this study, we would like to suggest the following recommendations to IGAD and its Member States for evidence-based policy design and implementation in Kenya to strengthen the on-going refugee's economic inclusion. As the findings reveal that the refugees' livelihoods have been negatively affected and their level of dependency has increased then:

The IGAD and its Member States should allow international organizations to settle and employ refugees who are in urban areas as well those who are in Kalobeyei settlement; so that refugees will be able to have a sustainable income. The IGAD and its Member States should redesign the refugees' economic inclusion in Kenya and look for the best way to include the refugees in the host community, so that, they will not be negatively impacted if a future pandemic happens. The IGAD and its Member States should allow refugees to work in the formal job market by giving them work permit so that they will not be affected when another pandemic breaks out. The IGAD and its Member States should strengthen the refugees in the Kalobeyei settlement income generating activities, as well as the urban refugees, so that, they will not rely only on the informal wage earning. This will prevent their livelihood from being negatively impacted by another COVID-19 outbreak.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study has analysed the COVID-19 effect on the on-going refugees' economic inclusion in the host country, Kenya. Our scientific analysis has been inspired by the difference-in-difference method where we estimate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on the various camps and settlements. We used the COVID-19 as the first treatment for all the camps and settlements and Kalobeyei is our treated group as well as urban area. Furthermore, we compared the treatment groups and the formal camps such as Kakuma and Dadaab by using the refugee's salary and aid received within the period from February to May.

The findings show that the refugees (Kalobeyei and Urban areas) in the process of economic inclusion in the host country, Kenya have been drastically affected by the COVID-19 outbreak. Their salary has been significantly and negatively affected compared to the refugees in the formal camps (Kakuma and Dadaab). Nevertheless, the findings

show that the refugees' dependency level has been increased because of COVID-19 outbreak. Moreover, the aid received by the refugees in the process of inclusion has received more aid than the refugees in the formal camps. This is due to their job lost, and many international organisations came in to give them aid, so that they would be able to sustain their households during the lockdown and restriction put in place by the host country government.

Meanwhile, the recommendation from this study is that, the policy makers in the host country who are working towards refugees' economic inclusion should rethink how to strengthen refugees' income generating activities so that they will not be so affected by a similar pandemic. The host country (Kenya) should allow refugees to work in the formal sector so that they will not be laid off if another pandemic breaks out.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alaoui, S. (2020). Inside Dadaab Refugee Camps: Safe-Proofing Relief Distribution During COVID-19. United Nations Foundation (UNF). <https://unfoundation.org/blog/post/inside-dadaab-refugee-camps-safe-proofing-relief-distribution-during-covid-19/>
- [2] Betts, A., Easton-Calabria, E., & Pincock, K. (2021). Localising Public Health: Refugee-led organisations as first and last responders in COVID-19. *World Development*, 139: 10531(03), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105311>
- [3] Bhagat, R. B., Harihar, R. R. S., Archana, S., Roy, K., & Govil, D. (2020). The COVID-19, Migration and Livelihood in India: A Background Paper for Policy Makers (Issue April). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12528.00008>
- [4] Braam, D. H., Srinivasan, S., Church, L., Sheikh, Z., Jephcott, F. L., & Bukachi, S. (2021). Lockdowns, lives and livelihoods: the impact of COVID-19 and public health responses to conflict affected populations - a remote qualitative study in Baidoa and Mogadishu, Somalia. *Springer*, 15(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S13031-021-00382-5>
- [5] Bukuluki, P., Mwenyango, H., Katongole, S. P., Sidhva, D., & Palattiyil, G. (2020). The socio-economic and psychosocial impact of Covid-19 pandemic on urban refugees in Uganda. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2(1), 100045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100045>
- [6] Dempster, H., Ginn, T., Graham, J., Guerrero Ble, M., Jayasinghe, D., Shorey, B., Beltramo, T., Fix, J., Mejia-Mantilla, C., Schmieding, F., Tabasso, D., Tanner, J., Hirose, Y., Huang, C., Lang, H., Lee, E., Post, L., Saez, P., Ruauadel, H., & Schwartz, E. (2020a). Locked Down and Left Behind: The Impact of COVID-19 on Refugees' Economic Inclusion. <https://www.cgdev.org/>
- [7] Dempster, H., Ginn, T., Graham, J., Guerrero Ble, M., Jayasinghe, D., Shorey, B., Beltramo, T., Fix, J., Mejia-Mantilla, C., Schmieding, F., Tabasso, D., Tanner, J., Hirose, Y., Huang, C., Lang, H., Lee, E., Post, L., Saez, P., Ruauadel, H., & Schwartz, E. (2020b). Locked Down and Left Behind: The Impact of COVID-

- 19 on Refugees' Economic Inclusion (Issue July). <https://www.cgdev.org/>
- [8] Finsterwalder, J., Kabadayi, S., Fisk, R. P., & Boenigk, S. (2020). Creating hospitable service systems for refugees during a pandemic: leveraging resources for service inclusion. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTP-07-2020-0175>
- [9] Golesorkhi, L. Z., Fortson, G., Harder, K., & Riedmann, T. (2020). Centering community in COVID-19 responses: refugee women's livelihoods in a global pandemic. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-07-2020-0332>
- [10] Hanck, C., Arnold, M., Gerber, A., & Schmelzer, M. (2019). *Introduction to Econometrics with R*.
- [11] ILO. (2020). As job losses escalate, nearly half of global workforce at risk of losing livelihoods. ILO. http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_743036/lang--en/index.htm
- [12] Lau, L. S., Samari, G., Moresky, R. T., Casey, S. E., Kachur, S. P., Roberts, L. F., & Zard, M. (2020). COVID-19 in humanitarian settings and lessons learned from past epidemics. In *Nature Medicine* (Vol. 26, Issue 5, pp. 647–648). *Nature Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0851-2>
- [13] Mulu, N. T. (2021). COVID-19 and its Effects on the Lives and Livelihoods of Congolese Female Asylum Seekers and Refugees in the City of Cape Town. *African Human Mobility Review*, Volume 7 N(May), 1–22.
- [14] UNHCR. (2020a). Kenya - Socio-economic impact of COVID-19 on refugees in Kenya. UNHCR Web Page. <https://microdata.unhcr.org/index.php/catalog/245>
- [15] UNHCR. (2020b). KENYA STATISTICS PACKAGE. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/05/Kenya-Statistics-Package-30-April-2020.pdf>
- [16] UNHCR. (2020c). UNHCR Kenya expresses continued solidarity in ongoing efforts to contain the COVID-19 pandemic and calls for more support. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/17875-press-release-unhcr-kenya-expresses-continued-solidarity-in-ongoing-efforts-to-contain-the-covid-19-pandemic-and-calls-for-more-support.html>
- [17] UNHCR. (2021). KENYA Registered refugees and asylum-seekers: As of 31 May 2021 (Issue May).
- [18] UNHCR Kenya. (2017). Kalobeyei Settlement. UNHCR Web Page. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/kalobeyei-settlement>
- [19] UNHCR Kenya. (2020). Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED P). UNHCR Web Page. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/kisedp-2>
- [20] UNHCR Kenya. (2021a). Dadaab Refugee Complex. UNHCR Web Page. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/dadaab-refugee-complex>
- [21] UNHCR Kenya. (2021b). Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kalobeyei Integrated Settlement. UNHCR Web Page. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/kakuma-refugee-camp>
- [22] UNICEF Kenya. (2020). Kenya Humanitarian Situation Report (Issue 3).