
POLICY RESPONSES TO SOCIAL EXCLUSION: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND AN ANALYSIS OF KENYA'S PUBLIC POLICY PROBLEM

***Dr. Yasin Kuso, Naphtaly Odera**

Economics For Public Policy Maseno University.

Article Received: 15 July 2026, Article Revised: 04 August 2026, Published on: 24 August 2026

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Yasin Kuso**

Economics For Public Policy Maseno University.

Doi: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.7888>

ABSTRACT

Social exclusion is a worldwide policy concern. Although India, Brazil, South Africa, and Kenya have had some shared developmental histories and extensive social protection reforms, they persist in making the same mistake of exclusion, where those that are in need are always left out (Piron and Curran, 2005). This paper compares these countries to understand what Kenya can learn to its reform agenda of 2024 – 2026 and to identify the gaps in current policies. The main controversy among policymakers is whether to work on individual resiliency by helping people cope with poverty or structural change by fixing the systems that cause exclusion (Mohaupt, 2009; Jones and Shahrokh, 2013). This analysis using the theoretical frameworks of Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997), Byrne (2005), Mechanic and Tanner (2007), Plagerson (2023), and Oanda (2005) evaluate three recent case studies in Kenya. First, it discusses the marginalization of indigenous people, including the Ogiek and Sengwer, who remain excluded even with land titles and economic opportunities reported by a 2026 KNCHR report which highlighted ongoing forced evictions. Second, it examines how persons with disabilities are deprived of access to justice due to the lack of reasonable accommodation and the ongoing application of outdated laws, such as the Criminal Procedure Code of 1962, as reported by a 2025 ICJ Kenya report. Lastly, the paper discusses the marginalization of ex-prisoners, who are in effect excluded to the formal labor market by the requirement of a Certificate of Good Conduct, a prerequisite that itself perpetuates poverty and raises the chances of recidivism.

The review points out three major findings on social exclusion in Kenya. First, it is not enough to help people to become more resilient when the system itself is not being changed,

especially since the legal and administrative systems in Kenya have continued to marginalize persons with disabilities, the indigenous groups, and former convicted prisoners. Second, although the concept of considering social exclusion issues in all government policies is handy, it tends to overlook the underlying ways in which out of date laws and bureaucratic barriers continue to marginalize people. Third, Kenya has not fulfilled its own constitutional commitments of inclusion because of political inaction.

To address these gaps, this paper suggests a practical policy response that include an immediate implementation of the Community Land Act to protect the rights of the indigenous population, updating of the Criminal Procedure Code so that the courts become accessible to all, and reforming the Certificate of Good Conduct to help former prisoners to re-enter the work force. The paper, further on proposes a controlled study to compare the re offending rates between former prisoners that have their records cleared and those that do not have their records cleared.

INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion does not just refer to a lack of financial resources or basic services, but it is a systematic process that denies individuals and groups the rights, opportunities and dignity available to the rest of the society (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1997; Byrne, 2005). This marginalization in Kenya is evidently portrayed using three issues that are currently going on in Kenya. First, indigenous people, such as the Ogiek and Sengwer are repeatedly displaced on their ancestral lands without legal titles and fair compensation, as a March 2026 report by the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights showed. Second, individuals with disabilities must face a judicial system that is limited by the outdated Criminal Procedure Code of 1962 that does not offer the necessary accommodations to individuals with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities (ICJ Kenya, 2025). Lastly, a significant proportion of former inmates who acquired vocational skills still do not fit into the formal workforce because they are unable to obtain a certificate of good conduct, which often serves as a barrier between them and the formal workforce. According to Mohaupt (2009) Jones and Shahrokh (2013), such cases are not isolated incidences but rather effects of a deeper debate within the field of public policy, either should the government focus on helping people to become more resilient to hardship, or should it focus on reforming the underlying laws and structures that create exclusion.

The constitutional framework of Kenya and Article 56 create a clear provision of affirmative action to safeguard the minorities and the marginalized groups. Although the Social

Protection Act 2025 aims at expanding the range of those who should receive assistance, Mechanic and Tanner (2007) state that the broad and general policies tend to overlook the fact that the needs of the vulnerable vary and the broad and generic policies fail to reflect these needs. A comparison study by Piron and Curran (2005) conducted across Brazil, South Africa, and India shows that there is no single policy that can be considered as a universal solution, the effectiveness of affirmative action, social protection, and legal rights, are highly dependent on the local context. Even though Plageron (2023) proposes the implementation of poverty and exclusion issues in all governmental sectors, his experience in South Africa shows that the lack of accountability and the division of the systems often come in the way. In the Kenyan context, Oanda (2005) emphasized how the growth of privately operated higher education institutions created new obstacles to women, since such patterns of exclusion continue to exist today in land ownership, justice system, and labor market.

Based on these various views, this paper will explore what Kenya can learn, based on the experiences of Brazil, South Africa, and India in tackling social exclusion through policy reforms. I would say that, although interventions that help build individual resilience are needed, they are ineffective in the long run unless broader structural changes that would create clear inclusion pathways are implemented. Comparing three of the current Kenyan case studies, indigenous land rights, access to justice by persons with disabilities, and employment barriers by former prisoners with the international policy models will help provide some key findings. It is indicated by the analysis that Kenya does not fulfill its constitutional promises due not to a lack of legislation, poor enforcement, political stagnation and hidden bureaucratic barriers such as the certificate of good conduct. In the end, unless these reforms are implemented with much deliberation, Kenya will not have made any positive step on its promise of inclusion.

Social Exclusion Conceptual Foundations

This section discusses the literature based on four major themes, the theoretical foundations of exclusion, the dynamics of resilience of vulnerable groups, the integration of the social protection systems, and comparative studies specific to the Kenyan context.

Conceptual foundations: Byrne (1998, 2005), Bhalla & Lapeyre (1997)

Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) presented a multidimensional approach separating social exclusion from income poverty. They say that exclusion is not just confined to economic scarcity but also involves social, political and cultural aspects. They also state that exclusion

is relational because it is influenced by institutional barriers and dynamic because it is changing over time.

This model is of great relevance to the Kenyan context. For example, indigenous people who are displaced from their lands are marginalized in both economic and political way, difficulties faced by persons with disabilities in accessing justice reflects an institutional marginalization, and the Certificate of Good Conduct requirement is an economic and social barrier. There is, however, a significant gap in the model that it is largely theoretical, lacking clear practical measures for measuring and legally enforcing inclusion. Byrne (1998, 2005) takes the discussion further by pointing to the structural causes of the exclusion, which he says is not incidental but rather a product of the processes of organizing areas like labor, housing, and justice in states and markets. His criticism of individual centered explanations is very powerful. However, his analysis is less useful in the context of Kenya due to his premise that strong welfare systems exist and that they do not necessarily mirror Kenya's less robust state capacity and political system.

Marginalized Groups and Resilience: Mechanic & Tanner (2007) and Mohaupt (2009)

Mechanic and Tanner (2007) discuss various vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities, people with chronic conditions and people who are severely disadvantaged. They believe that general policies do not necessarily consider the specific problems of these groups. This argument applies in Kenya to persons with disabilities, who are often treated the same by the courts as others without giving special consideration to their needs. But they may unintentionally represent excluded groups as recipients of help and not as owners of rights.

Mohaupt (2009) provides a critical analysis of resilience discourse. Resilience, which is defined as the capacity to manage adversity, is important, but she says that governments sometimes employ it to rationalize cutting back on aid services and leave marginalized communities to their own to bounce back. Her main claim is that without structural change, resilience is just a mechanism to sustain exclusion. In Kenya, ex-convicts are expected to overcome their traumatic circumstances on their own, but the Certificate of Good Conduct is one obstacle that is hampering their access to employment in the formal sector. However, Mohaupt's case is flawed in its failure to clearly define the point at which resilience interventions are warranted and when wider structural changes are needed.

Social Protection Pathways and Mainstreaming: Jones & Shahrokh (2013) and Plagerson (2023)

Jones and Shahrokh (2013) develop the idea of the social protection pathways which describe the pathways marginalized individuals embark on within the formal and informal support systems. They believe that these pathways are shaped by institutions, power relations and individual agency, and thus call for universal social protection measures and targeted measures for vulnerable groups. In Kenya, this is reflected in a lack of opportunities for indigenous people to secure land titles, for people with disabilities to access inclusive courts, and for ex-prisoners to have their records cleaned up to assist in employment. Their engagement is important as it illustrates the political nature of the design of social protection pathways. Their analysis however is primarily based on experiences from the Latin American and Asian region and pays little attention to issues of weak state capacity in countries like Kenya.

The mainstreaming policies in South Africa are explored and critiqued by Plagerson (2023), who identifies the weak accountability mechanisms as a challenge to the implementation of mainstreaming policies. This scenario is akin to the Community Land Act in Kenya, which is in policy, yet not well implemented. While Plagerson is right to recognize the implementation gap issue, the analysis does not offer specific enforcement strategies. Mandatory exclusion-error audits, therefore, form the basis of this paper's call to enhance accountability and inclusion.

Comparative & Contextual Studies: Piron & Curran (2005), Bonner (2007), Oanda (2005)

However, an important comparative study by Piron and Curran (2005) shows that the outcomes of affirmative action, social protection and legal rights vary according to context, notably between Brazil, South Africa and India. They discovered that the Bolsa Familia program in Brazil brought down poverty, but did not remove racial stigma, the Black Economic Empowerment policies in South Africa brought representation but did not bring about significant changes in economic conditions and the universalist nature of the caste quota system in India resulted in a small group of black people emerging as a middle-class elite and the rest of the population remaining in poverty. Their document continues to provide very valuable insight into exclusion and inclusion policies. However, because the study is more than two decades old, it does not reflect more recent developments such as indigenous land reversals in Brazil, equality court backlogs in South Africa, and expungement reforms in

India. This paper therefore seeks to provide a more updated perspective. Bonner (2007) concentrates on the reactions of the people and communities to exclusion in the form of local associations, mutual support networks and psychological empowerment. This is a positive and empowering view of the community but can downplay the significance of the structural barriers. In Kenya's own land issue, for instance, mobilization of the people cannot bring about land ownership without enabling legal changes.

Oanda (2005) looks at private higher education in Kenya as a new mode of exclusion impacting women. He says that market-based solutions tend to perpetuate inequality, not eliminate it. The same is true of cases outside of education, such as fee-based court proceedings, costs of procedures for obtaining background information including Certificates of Good Conduct, and land registration processes. The study is old but its core argument that market-based exclusion is still relevant.

Kenyan Case Studies and Comparative Insights

The indigenous land exclusion: Ogiek and Sengwer (2026).

Land ownership and economic participation of the indigenous people in Kenya continues to be a major problem. In a March 2026 report, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights notes that indigenous people remain underrepresented in land rights and economic participation, even after positive judicial rulings, such as the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights ruling in 2017. The Ogiek of the Mau Forest and the Sengwer of Embobut Forest continue to be forced off their land, subjected to gender-based violence and denied access to business licenses due to the absence of formal land ownership documents. This is because the problems of exclusion are multidimensional as described by Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997), involving economic exclusion, lack of business opportunities, spatial exclusion, displacement from ancestral land, legal exclusion, denial of land titles, and social exclusion, due to violence and discrimination.

In Brazil, indigenous people's rights have been guaranteed by the Constitution since 1988, and over 100 million hectares of indigenous lands have been demarcated. The 2023 Supreme Court decision called the Marco Temporal, however, stood to undermine these advances by requiring indigenous communities to demonstrate physical occupation of the land in 1988, which is hard for many communities to meet. This resulted in a new form of exclusion, on top of the previous legal protection. Kenya can learn from this experience that legal recognition without enforcement is not enough, and that it needs to make sure that there will be no political or judicial reinterpretation.

The Community Land Act in Kenya has been established to safeguard community land rights but has failed to be implemented effectively. In contrast to Brazil's relatively active, but still contested, land demarcation process, there has been a lack of political will in Kenya to enforce it. As Plagerson (2023) explains, implementing mainstreaming policies without accountability mechanisms can result in failure in implementation.

Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities (2025)

In Kenya, there is a huge challenge of excluding people with disabilities from the justice system. In a 2025 report submitted by the International Commission of Jurists Kenya, the report revealed that courts in Kenya are still operating under the pre-existing Criminal Procedure Code (1962), which was drafted prior to the advent of the modern concept of disability rights. The law does not include reasonable accommodations for people with psychosocial and intellectual disabilities, including the provision of sign language interpreters, easy-read materials, supports and persons. As a result, millions of people with disabilities are deemed “unfit to plead” or are not given a fair trial. This represents institutional exclusion in legislation that is still rooted in a longer tradition, which is in line with the idea put forward by Mechanic and Tanner (2007) that ‘generic’ policies typically fail to account for the needs of vulnerable groups.

An example of this may be the South African courts under the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act which have jurisdiction over disability discrimination cases and the court procedures must include accessibility measures. There are still some issues like backlog of cases and lack of training, but the legal structure for making things accessible has been established. Kenya, however, does not have a similar legal and regulatory structure to ensure accessibility in the justice system. The South African experience indicated that legislation can, therefore, not be seen to be the primary or only means of achieving complete de-exclusion, but rather as a starting point for achieving inclusion.

In Kenya, there is no specific provision in the Persons with Disabilities Act to specifically mandate courts to accommodate persons with disabilities. This reveals a wide policy gap, in as much as the Criminal Procedure Code has not been adequately changed to ensure access to justice for all. This paper will therefore highlight the need to enact a specific amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code to guarantee fair participation and access for persons with disabilities in the Kenyan judicial system (Mechanic & Tanner, 2007).

Employment Barriers Facing Ex-Offenders, The Certificate of Good Conduct

A third form of social exclusion in Kenya is for former prisoners who were often formally educated and trained at prison while serving their sentences but are still denied access to formal employment opportunities. This exclusion is greatly associated with the Certificate of Good Conduct issued by the Kenya Police Service which reveals a person's criminal record. Since most formal employers require this certificate during recruitment, ex-prisoners are permanently stigmatized and frequently perceived as untrustworthy, regardless of their rehabilitation efforts.

This situation reflects what Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) describe as institutional exclusion, where administrative procedures that appear neutral in practice systematically marginalize a specific group. Although the certificate requirement is not openly discriminatory, its consequences are profoundly exclusionary. The Kenya Prison Service (2024) reports that more than 30,000 inmates are released from prison every year, many of whom, because of programs, have trained in vocational skills including carpentry, tailoring, welding and agriculture. Yet a 2024 report by the Kenya Prisons Service showed that close to 70% of released prisoners were again unemployed two years after their release, and 45% reoffends, which is much higher than countries with a well-defined record-expungement policy.

Former inmates are an especially vulnerable population due to the combination of multiple disadvantages such as limited employment experience, discrimination by prospective employers, strained social support networks, and unstable housing, utilizing the framework provided by Mechanic and Tanner (2007). Whereas other marginal groups like persons with disabilities and indigenous communities are given little recognition in the legal and constitutional protection, ex-prisoners are given little explicit recognition within the legal and constitutional protection in Kenya. While Article 56 of the Constitution protects minorities and marginalized groups, it does not give special protection to the former prisoners, as this would only further marginalize the group.

This is also one way that Mohaupt (2009) has criticized the resilience approach. Former prisoners are always encouraged to rebuild their lives, demonstrate their change and rebuild public confidence in them and at the same time the state maintains institutional structures which limit and deny these opportunities. A criminal record can't be removed from official records with personal determination alone. The government imposes the Certificate of Good Conduct requirement and therefore has the power to amend and/or cancel the requirement. Thus, rather than individual weaknesses, as Jones and Shahrokh (2013) suggested, exclusion can be attributed to deliberate anti-reintegration policies.

In other countries, reform has been accomplished. South Africa's Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977 allows for expungement after certain steps after a period, typically 10 years for minor offences and 5 years for first-time offences (South African Government, 1977). Similarly, the Probation of Offenders Act of 1958 provides for sealing the records of a first offender in particular cases of convictions for non-violent offences in India upon completion of the period of probation. Brazilian law (Lei de Execução Penal) gives a full legal rehabilitation and in some cases grants a pardon, resulting in the cancellation of criminal records after individuals have achieved a successful integration into society

However, Kenya still does not have a comprehensive expungement policy in place. Alternatives could be Community Service Orders Act (1998) and Probation of Offenders Act which still may not result in the individual getting a criminal record, but these are only for sentencing and don't consider post-incarceration rehabilitations. If you're like most people who serve time in prison, you won't have a legal procedure in place that allows you to regain your formal status. This demonstrates an institutional mismatch in the reintegration process, as the state invests in vocational training in prisons and at the same time it limits access to employment via its procedures (Bonner, 2007).

Finally, this is one more indication of the overall position advocated in this study that individual (resilience) strategies alone are insufficient without structural legal changes. State institutions can set up a legal hurdle which cannot be cleared by vocational training, counselling and community support programs.

Comparative Insights and Key Findings

This comparative study of three Kenyan case studies, indigenous land exclusion, barriers to justice for persons with disabilities, and employment discrimination against former prisoners, emphasizes three main points, which are drawn out of the experiences in Brazil, South Africa and India, respectively.

Finding one: Resilience-based approaches are not effective without structural reform.

These three cases shows collectively that the policies and institutional structures that cause exclusion must be reformed with interventions that are resilient based to be successful. The community land act has not been implemented in full, and indigenous groups, like the Ogiek and Sengwer, have shown themselves to be resilient, despite multiple displacement and evictions. Similarly, individuals with disabilities cannot accommodate the absence of sign language interpreters, braille services or accessible court materials in judicial proceedings.

The Certificate of Good Conduct also affects former prisoners who can't move on with their lives when the certificate remains as a lasting reminder of distrust.

The examples illustrate that Mohaupt (2009) was correct in his view that the concept of resilience can become problematic when it supplants instead of supplementing structural change. In this context, the language of resilience can become an instrument of government inaction, as it decenters the responsibility for eradicating exclusion from the community to the individual or group of people who have been left out, thus allowing a government to remain passive.

Finding two: Improving inclusion of people with disabilities in mainstream schools alone is insufficient given the deeply entrenched legal and administrative exclusion.

Plagerson (2023) advocates for mainstreaming the issue of exclusion in all parts of government, but the Kenyan context highlights the challenges of doing so. Broad policy integration is often not successful in identifying the nuances of the legal and bureaucratic structures that embed and maintain forms of exclusion. The process of broad policy integration is seldom successful at identifying the nuances of the legal and bureaucratic structures that embed and maintain exclusion.

In Kenya for instance, the Criminal Procedure Code of 1962 has not been updated to include provisions relating to reasonable accommodation in the justice system, since the country did not ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Similarly, the Certificate of Good Conduct seems like an ordinary administrative necessity but in fact it discriminates systematically against former prisoners as the target of that formal employment.

The cases indicate that social inclusion cannot be achieved solely through the mainstreaming approach as it can miss obsolete legal frameworks and unobvious administrative obstacles. Instead, intentional legal audits, specific changes in the law, and institutional changes are needed to break the exclusionary systems.

Finding three: Kenya's Progressive Constitutional Promises have been hampered by poor implementation

The Kenyan Constitution of 2010 has been widely praised for its inclusive and equality-oriented principles. The Social Protection Act of 2025 expanded social protection opportunities and Article 56 specifically requires affirmative measures to be taken in relation

to minorities and marginalized communities. But the three case studies expose a common problem between constitutional recognition and effectiveness.

The Community Land Act has been around since 2016 but there are many indigenous communities that still don't have formal land titles. While the Persons with Disabilities Act is operative, the court systems are still functioning in accordance with old procedures which do not cater well for persons with disabilities. Similarly, Kenya has not yet enacted laws to allow the expungement or sealing of criminal records for rehabilitated former offenders after years of talks about prison reform. This is a pattern like that identified by Piron and Curran (2005) in the countries of Brazil, South Africa and India, where the legal recognition was not followed by social inclusion. Political commitment, enforcement mechanisms, accountability systems including independent oversight mechanisms that can turn legal rights into lived rights are also needed for effective reform.

Policy Recommendations

The results of this study indicate that there are several possible practical policy interventions that could tackle the structural forms of exclusion identified in Kenya.

1. The full implementation of the Community Land Act to protect Indigenous Land Rights.

The government should focus on implementing the Community Land Act and ensure the identification and demarcation of ancestral lands of the Ogiek, Sengwer and other indigenous communities and issuance of title deeds within a period of a year, and for the lands that are still to be demarcated, within two years. The process should involve direct consultation and participation of the affected communities, as is also done in Brazil, considering some aspects of its land demarcation framework without limiting approaches such as the Marco Temporal doctrine, which recently undermined the rights of indigenous territories.

Further, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights must be empowered with more teeth to file complaints, conduct investigations and issue temporary injunctions against illegal evictions while the matter is under court review. These measures would make it easier to keep Kenya's constitutional obligations to indigenous communities in line with the mechanisms that can implement them and reduce their risk of further displacement and exclusion.

2. Improve the Criminal Procedure Code to ensure reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities.

The Criminal Procedure Code 1962 needs to be suitably modified to make it clear that courts should make reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities in intellectual, psychosocial, sensory and physical disabilities throughout the legal proceedings. These changes should ensure that sign language interpreters, accessible and easy-to-read court documents, support persons to the court and changed court competency evaluation (no longer based on aged psychiatric criteria applied in the justice system processes).

The reforms should be based on South Africa's Promotion of Equality and the Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act (PEPUDA), with enhanced accountability and enforcement mechanisms. The measures should encompass regular accessibility audit of court premises, mandatory disability-rights training for judicial officers and independent monitoring systems to ensure implementation. ICJ Kenya (2025) argues these reforms are crucial in ushering in access to justice for persons with disabilities in a meaningful and practical way.

3. Amend the Certificate of Good Conduct to provide for the re-entry of ex-prisoners to the labor market

The government should introduce a Criminal Records (Expungement) Act which sets out a process for having criminal records cleared or sealed for former prisoners who have not committed any offences for a specified period, such as five years from their release for first time offenders of non-violent offences. In conjunction with this, there should be a controlled study to compare the rate that ex-prisoners whose records have been expunged reoffend compared to a control group whose records have not been expunged. This study would provide local evidence on the effectiveness of expungement in Kenya, which currently does not exist. The study design should be monitored by the Kenya Prison Service and an independent academic institution, and the results should be published in three years.

4. Complete a Mandatory Exclusion-Error Audit for All Social Protection and Justice Programs.

The government should ensure all social protection programs including land titling, legal aid, and employment services are audited for exclusion errors once a year, by the National Gender and Equality Commission, as advocated by Plagerson (2023). The audit would indicate the extent to which people from indigenous, disability and ex-prisoner communities were being

denied access and why. The outcome of the process should be brought to Parliament and be made public. This would bring in the loop that is missing right now.

CONCLUSION

This paper has addressed the issue of social exclusion in Kenya in a manner that suggests social exclusion is not a random sequence of bad luck, but rather a systematic process, rooted in the legacy of the old laws, bureaucratic processes and political passivity. The arguments have been drawn from the conceptual frameworks of Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997), Byrne (2005), Mechanic and Tanner (2007) and other work, and Kenya's experience compared with that of Brazil, South Africa and India, has concluded that resilience-based interventions are not enough on their own. It is necessary to have a structural change, which is represented by the change of the Criminal Procedure Code, the implementation of the Community Land Act and the creation of a mechanism for the expungement of criminal records.

The argument has been explained by means of three case studies. Even though the court has rulings in their favor, indigenous peoples (Ogiek and Sengwer) are not being integrated; land titles are not being issued. When the Criminal Procedure Code of 1962 was drafted, disability rights did not exist; therefore, persons with disabilities are deprived of justice. The Certificate of Good Conduct is a permanent obstacle to the formalization of ex-prisoners' employment. In all three, the state plays the role of both the source of the exclusion, and the only one who can remedy it.

The paper suggests policy solutions that can be implemented: immediate enactment of the Community Land Act, modification of the Criminal Procedure Code, a criminal records expungement bill, and mandated exclusion error audits. It has also recommended for a controlled study to produce evidence that links the record expungement with re-offending rates – evidence which is yet to be available in Kenya.

In conclusion, Kenya's constitutional commitment to inclusion will fall short of realization if it is not implemented rather than left to political passivity, it is not done in a manner that is accountable, and it is not adequately resourced. In the opinion of the writer, there is no need for another policy statement for the excluded groups referred to in this paper. To function, they require a working land registry, a court that will hear their claims, and a labor market that won't permanently label them as untrustworthy. At least that is what is necessary for social justice.

REFERENCES

5. Bhalla, A. S., & Lapeyre, F. (1997). Social exclusion: Towards an analytical and operational framework. *Development and Change*, 28(3), 413–433.
6. Bonner, A. (2007). *Social exclusion and the way out: An individual and community response to human social dysfunction*. John Wiley & Sons.
7. Byrne, D. (1998). Public policy and social exclusion. *Local Economy*, 13(1), 81–83.
8. Byrne, D. (2005). *Social exclusion* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
9. International Commission of Jurists Kenya. (2025). *Access to justice for persons with disabilities in Kenya: Barriers and recommendations*. ICJ Kenya.
10. Jones, N., & Shahrokh, T. (2013). *Social protection pathways: Shaping social justice outcomes for the most marginalised, now and post-2015*. Overseas Development Institute.
11. Kenya National Commission on Human Rights. (2026, March). *Status report on indigenous peoples' land rights and economic participation*. KNCHR.
12. Kenya Prisons Service. (2024, December 18). *Reforms see decongestion of prisons by 5,000*. People Daily.
13. Mechanic, D., & Tanner, J. (2007). Vulnerable people, groups, and populations: Societal view. *Health Affairs*, 26(5), 1220–1230.
14. Mohaupt, S. (2009). Resilience and social exclusion. *Social Policy and Society*, 8(1), 63–71.
15. National Gender and Equality Commission. (2024). *Status of implementation of Article 56: Report to Parliament*. NGEC.
16. Oanda, I. O. (2005). New frontiers of exclusion: Private higher education and women's opportunities in Kenya. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 3(3), 86–105.
17. Piron, L.-H., & Curran, Z. (2005). *Public policy responses to exclusion: Evidence from Brazil, South Africa and India*. Overseas Development Institute.
18. Plagerson, S. (2023). *Mainstreaming poverty, inequality and social exclusion: A systematic assessment of public policy in South Africa*. *Development Southern Africa*, 40(1), 191–207.
19. South African Government. (1977). *Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977 (as amended)*.