



Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Research

**BORDER CONTROL MECHANISMS AND THE PREVENTION
OF RADICALIZATION IN THE HAGADERA REFUGEE
COMPLEX, GARISSA COUNTY, KENYA**

Abdikani Ibrahim Kala and Dr. Francis Mulu, PhD



Border Control Mechanisms and The Prevention of Radicalization in The Hagadera Refugee Complex, Garissa County, Kenya

Abdikani Ibrahim Kala

Corresponding Author, Kenyatta University

Dr. Francis Mulu, PhD

Lecturer, Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Kenyatta University, Kenya

Article History:

Published on: 11/06/2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20642041>

How to cite: Kala, A. I., & Mulu, F. (2026). Border Control Mechanisms and The Prevention of Radicalization in The Hagadera Refugee Complex, Garissa County, Kenya. *Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3(1), 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20642041>

Abstract:

Purpose of Study: This study examined the role of border control mechanisms in preventing radicalization within the Hagadera Refugee Complex, Garissa County, Kenya, focusing on effectiveness of border operations, inter-agency coordination, and implementation challenges in a porous Kenya–Somalia border context.

Methodology: A descriptive mixed-methods design was employed with 142 purposively sampled stakeholders. Data were collected using structured questionnaires, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS (descriptive and inferential

statistics), while qualitative data underwent thematic content analysis.

Findings: Border control mechanisms significantly reduced radicalization risks: intelligence sharing (mean=4.18), border screening (mean=4.12), and patrol surveillance (mean=4.05). Inter-agency coordination registered moderate-to-high collaboration (mean=3.84), though irregular joint forums (mean=3.69) constrained effectiveness. Key challenges included porous borders (mean=4.26), limited resources (mean=4.19), inadequate personnel (mean=4.10), and community mistrust (mean=3.97). Pearson correlation confirmed a strong positive relationship between border control measures and radicalization prevention ($r=0.642$, $p<0.01$). Regression analysis established border control as a significant predictor ($\beta=0.587$, $p<0.001$), explaining 41.2% of prevention outcome variance.

Conclusion: Proper operations, institutionalized coordination, and community engagement are essential for effective counter-radicalization in refugee settings. The study recommends targeted investment in surveillance technology, personnel capacity, formalized multi-stakeholder coordination frameworks, and trust-building community engagement programs to strengthen prevention outcomes.

Keywords: *border control, radicalization prevention, Hagadera Refugee Complex, inter-agency coordination, violent extremism, Kenya*

©2026 By The Authors. This Article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)



1. INTRODUCTION

The global rise of transnational terrorism has placed refugee-hosting areas along porous international borders under acute security scrutiny. Displaced populations living under conditions of socio-economic deprivation, restricted mobility, and limited livelihood options are considered vulnerable to extremist recruitment, making border management a critical component of national security strategy (Tseer et al., 2025). In Kenya, the challenge is particularly acute along the northeastern border with Somalia, a region characterized by persistent insecurity and the continued operational presence of Al-Shabaab.

The Hagadera Refugee Complex in Garissa County — one of the three camps comprising the Dadaab settlement — has hosted Somali refugees for over three decades and remains among the largest refugee settlements in the world. Its proximity to the Kenya–Somalia border, combined with high population density, limited livelihoods, and the socio-political fragility of its catchment area, creates conditions that may be exploited for extremist recruitment and ideological radicalization. The Kenyan government, in partnership with security agencies and humanitarian organizations, has deployed various border control mechanisms including physical barriers, biometric screening, patrol surveillance, intelligence sharing, and community monitoring to mitigate these risks (Kithii & Onyango, 2023).

Despite these interventions, reports of suspected radicalization activity, illegal cross-border movements, and extremist infiltration continue to emerge, raising questions about the adequacy and effectiveness of existing mechanisms (United Nations, 2019). Much of the existing scholarship on radicalization in Kenya focuses on urban centers such as Nairobi, Mombasa, and Garissa town, leaving a significant empirical gap regarding how border control functions specifically in refugee camp contexts. This study addresses that gap by examining the mechanisms, coordination dynamics, and structural challenges of border control in preventing radicalization in the Hagadera Refugee Complex.

The study was organized around three objectives: (i) to examine the effectiveness of border control operations in mitigating radicalization risks; (ii) to analyze coordination between border security agencies and humanitarian actors in preventing radicalization; and (iii) to evaluate the challenges encountered in implementing border control measures. The study was anchored on Routine Activity Theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979), which argue that crime — including radicalization — occurs when a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardians converge. This theoretical lens provided a coherent framework for understanding how border control measures reduce the opportunity space for extremist activities within refugee settings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW



2.1 Theoretical Framework: Routine Activity Theory

Routine Activity Theory (RAT), originally developed by Cohen and Felson (1979), asserts that deviant behaviour occurs when three elements converge in time and space: a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardians. Unlike criminological frameworks focused on individual psychology, RAT centres on environmental and structural conditions that create opportunities for harmful behaviour. In the context of violent extremism, the theory has been extended to explain how displacement, under-resourced environments, and inadequate security infrastructure create conditions conducive to radicalization (Hansen et al., 2022).

Applied to the Hagadera Refugee Complex, RAT helps explain the security dynamics at play. Motivated offenders — including recruiters operating on behalf of Al-Shabaab and other extremist networks — exploit the camp's social networks and cross-border mobility. Suitable targets are refugees experiencing economic exclusion, psychosocial trauma, and limited access to education or employment. The absence of capable guardians — manifested in understaffed border posts, fragmented surveillance systems, and weak community reporting mechanisms — further increases vulnerability (Abdalatif, 2021). Strengthening border control operations, therefore, functions as a direct strategy for reinstating capable guardianship and disrupting the convergence of these risk elements.

2.2 Border Control and Radicalization Prevention

Empirical evidence from diverse contexts illustrates the relationship between border control effectiveness and the containment of violent extremism. Kotia and Bonsoh (2024) found that resilience-building strategies along Ghana's northern border — combining community empowerment, intelligence sharing, and infrastructure investment — reduced radical influence in border communities. Their findings highlight the complementary roles of state security and local community agency in managing extremist risks. Similarly, Guldemann and Meloy (2020) demonstrated that proactive intelligence-based screening at embarkation points significantly reduced the passage of potential terrorist actors, underscoring the value of early-stage threat identification.

In the East African context, Badurdeen (2024) documented how Al-Shabaab and affiliated criminal networks exploit maritime border vulnerabilities along Kenya's coastal counties of Kwale, Kilifi, and Lamu, reinforcing the argument that border porosity — whether maritime or terrestrial — provides operational space for extremist activities. Oyosi (2024) evaluated formal border management mechanisms at the Namanga One Stop Border Post and found that integrated surveillance, inter-agency collaboration, and technological infrastructure significantly improved security outcomes, though these gains were more pronounced in structured commercial border settings than in informal humanitarian contexts such as Hagadera.



Kibaara and Muhindi (2025) examined the downstream impact of terrorism on human security in Nairobi County, demonstrating that inadequate pre-emptive border and security measures contributed to social, economic, and psychological harm. Their findings reinforce the importance of a preventive rather than reactive approach to border management. Collectively, these studies suggest that effective border control requires multi-layered, technology-supported, and community-integrated strategies — a framework directly applicable to the Hagadera context.

2.3 Coordination Between Security and Humanitarian Actors

The coordination between security agencies and humanitarian organizations in preventing radicalization has received growing attention in the scholarly literature. Eashae (2025) found that culturally adapted, community-led programs in Aotearoa New Zealand effectively countered radicalization by leveraging local identities and inclusive governance mechanisms. While the context differs markedly from that of Hagadera, the core principle — that community engagement must be integrated with formal security measures — translates across settings.

In the Kenyan context, Ibrahim and Wario (2022) assessed the role of community-based organizations in countering violent extremism in Isiolo County, finding that localized, participatory approaches to radicalization prevention produced more durable outcomes than top-down enforcement strategies. Larkin and Clark (2023) similarly found that community involvement in Garissa County strengthened resilience against violent extremism, though they noted that high population mobility and resource scarcity — conditions directly applicable to Hagadera — constrained programme effectiveness.

Oando (2022) evaluated counter-terrorism strategies in Mombasa County and concluded that a hybrid model combining intelligence operations, community engagement, and law enforcement partnerships was more effective than security-only approaches. These findings corroborate the argument that inter-agency coordination, when institutionalized and consistently implemented, reduces duplication of effort, strengthens information flow, and improves early identification of radicalization threats.

2.4 Challenges in Border Control Implementation

Several structural and operational challenges constrain the effectiveness of border control in preventing radicalization. Mutisya (2024) identified inadequate funding, limited technological capacity, and insufficient training as persistent barriers to effective counter-terrorism operations in Kenya. Amomo (2024) noted in the Central Asian context that fragmented legislative frameworks and poor inter-agency communication created institutional blind spots that extremist networks readily exploited.

Sempijja and Nkosi (2021) conducted a critical analysis of Kenya's counter-terrorism legal framework and found that the tension between security enforcement and human rights obligations



frequently limited the scope of security operations. This tension is particularly salient in refugee settings, where international humanitarian law imposes stringent protections on displaced persons. Shafieiou and Haq (2023), examining radicalization pathways in Nigeria, reinforced the view that socio-economic marginalization — rather than ideology alone — is a primary driver of extremist recruitment, indicating that border security strategies must be complemented by social and economic interventions.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design and Study Area

The study employed a descriptive mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of border control dynamics in the Hagadera Refugee Complex. Descriptive designs are appropriate for studies seeking to systematically characterize phenomena, assess perceptions, and identify relationships among variables (Shinija, 2024). The integration of qualitative data from interviews and focus group discussions enriched the statistical findings by capturing contextual nuance and stakeholder perspectives.

The study was conducted at the Hagadera Refugee Complex, located within Dadaab Sub-County, Garissa County, Kenya. Hagadera is one of three camps constituting the Dadaab settlement — the largest refugee settlement in Kenya and one of the largest in the world. Its strategic location approximately 80 kilometres from the Kenya–Somalia border makes it a critical site for examining the intersection of border security and refugee protection. The camp hosts primarily Somali refugees and operates under a multi-actor governance framework involving UNHCR, the Refugee Affairs Secretariat (RAS), the Kenya Police, Kenya Defence Forces, and numerous humanitarian organizations.

3.2 Target Population and Sampling

The target population comprised 220 individuals with direct professional involvement in border control or radicalization prevention activities in and around the Hagadera Refugee Complex, including border security personnel, camp administrators, local government officials, humanitarian workers, and community security representatives. Purposive sampling was employed to ensure that only respondents with relevant knowledge and operational experience were included, enhancing the quality and relevance of the data (Campbell et al., 2020).

The Yamane formula was applied to determine a statistically adequate sample size, yielding 142 respondents. Proportional allocation was used to distribute the sample across stakeholder categories, ensuring demographic and functional representation. Table 1 presents the study's sampling framework.



Table 1: Sample Distribution by Stakeholder Category

Stakeholder Category	Population (N)	Sample (n)	% of Total
Border Police & KDF Officers	60	39	27.5
Refugee Camp Administrators	30	19	13.4
Local Government Officials	40	26	18.3
Humanitarian / UNHCR Workers	40	26	18.3
Community Security Representatives	50	32	22.5
Total	220	142	100.0

Note. Sample proportionally allocated using the Yamane formula (Kothari, 2022).

3.3 Data Collection and Instruments

Data were collected using three instruments: structured questionnaires, key informant interview guides, and focus group discussion protocols. The questionnaire, which served as the primary instrument, included closed-ended items measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) and open-ended questions for qualitative elaboration. A pilot study was conducted with 14 respondents from Ifo Refugee Camp — a nearby settlement with comparable characteristics — to assess instrument reliability. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the key constructs exceeded the 0.70 threshold, confirming adequate internal consistency (Taber, 2018).

Content validity was established through expert review by scholars in security studies and practitioners in border management and refugee protection, who assessed the clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness of the instruments. Data collection employed a drop-and-pick-later strategy, allowing respondents three to five days to complete questionnaires at their convenience. Ethical approval was obtained from Kenyatta University's Ethics Review Committee, and research authorization was granted by NACOSTI, the Garissa County Commissioner's office, and UNHCR's Hagadera field coordination office. Informed consent was secured from all participants prior to data collection.

3.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics — including frequencies, means, and standard deviations — were used to characterize respondents' perceptions. Inferential analysis included Pearson's Product Moment Correlation to examine the strength and



direction of the relationship between border control measures and radicalization prevention, and ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to determine the predictive influence of border control on prevention outcomes. A significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ was applied throughout. Qualitative data from open-ended responses, interviews, and focus groups were analyzed using thematic analysis, involving systematic coding and identification of recurring patterns.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Response Rate and Demographic Profile

Of the 142 questionnaires distributed, 128 were successfully completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 90.1% (Table 2). This rate substantially exceeded the 70% threshold considered adequate for reliable inference in social science research (Hussey et al., 2025). The high rate of participation is attributable to the researcher's prior engagement with target groups and the relevance of the topic to respondents' professional responsibilities.

Table 2: Questionnaire Response Rate

Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Questionnaires Returned	128	90.1
Questionnaires Not Returned	14	9.9
Total Distributed	142	100.0

Note. N = 142 distributed questionnaires.

The majority of respondents were male (64.8%), reflecting the gender composition of frontline security, military, and border management roles in Kenya (Table 3). Female respondents (35.2%) were concentrated in administrative, humanitarian, and community engagement functions. In terms of experience, 54.7% of respondents had served for six or more years in their respective roles, indicating a well-experienced sample with substantial knowledge of border control operations and radicalization risks.

Table 3: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Male	83	64.8
Female	45	35.2
Total	128	100.0

Note. n = 128 valid responses.



4.2 Border Control Mechanisms and Mitigation of Radicalization Risks

Respondents rated five core border control mechanisms using a five-point Likert scale. The results, presented in Table 4, revealed an overall mean of 4.04, indicating strong agreement that border control mechanisms play a significant role in preventing radicalization in the Hagadera Refugee Complex.

Table 4: Perceived Effectiveness of Border Control Mechanisms (n = 128)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Border screening reduces infiltration by extremist elements	4.12	0.81
Patrol surveillance limits illegal cross-border movement	4.05	0.88
Intelligence sharing enhances early detection of radicalization	4.18	0.76
Community surveillance supports threat identification	3.96	0.91
Use of technology strengthens border monitoring	3.89	0.94
Overall Mean	4.04	

Note. Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree. Mean > 3.50 indicates agreement.

Intelligence sharing recorded the highest mean score (4.18, SD = 0.76), indicating that timely information exchange between security agencies was regarded as the most effective mechanism for early detection of radicalization threats. Respondents noted that collaborative intelligence operations allowed agencies to act proactively before radicalization escalated. This finding aligns with Boin and Lodge (2021), who established that intelligence-led border management disrupts extremist recruitment networks and cross-border movement. Border screening received a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.81), with respondents emphasizing that systematic identity verification at entry and exit points was critical for limiting extremist infiltration. Studies by Magwood et al. (2022) similarly highlight that rigorous screening reduces opportunities for radical elements to enter refugee environments.

Patrol surveillance was rated 4.05 (SD = 0.88), reflecting strong agreement that continuous patrols along border corridors deter illegal movement and provide early security warnings. Community surveillance recorded a mean of 3.96 (SD = 0.91), with respondents acknowledging that refugee leaders and local residents contribute valuable threat intelligence, though effectiveness was constrained by trust deficits between communities and security agencies. Technology-assisted



monitoring registered a mean of 3.89 (SD = 0.94); while respondents recognized the contribution of surveillance equipment and biometric systems, many noted that inadequate resources and limited technical capacity reduced operational impact.

4.3 Coordination Between Security Agencies and Humanitarian Actors

Table 5 presents respondents' perceptions of inter-agency coordination and its contribution to radicalization prevention. The overall mean of 3.84 indicated a moderate to high level of collaboration, suggesting that coordination contributed positively to security outcomes, though important gaps remained.

Table 5: Coordination Between Security Agencies and Humanitarian Actors (n = 128)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Security agencies collaborate effectively with humanitarian actors	3.78	0.92
Information sharing improves radicalization prevention	4.01	0.84
Joint forums enhance trust and cooperation	3.69	0.95
Humanitarian actors support security objectives	3.83	0.90
Coordination reduces duplication of efforts	3.91	0.86
Overall Mean	3.84	

Note. Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Information sharing between agencies recorded the highest mean in this dimension (4.01, SD = 0.84), indicating that the timely exchange of risk assessments and community-sourced intelligence was central to prevention efforts. Coordination in reducing duplication of effort scored 3.91 (SD = 0.86), reflecting appreciation for joint planning even as respondents acknowledged persistent overlaps in mandates. Humanitarian actors' contribution to security objectives was rated 3.83 (SD = 0.90), with respondents noting that psychosocial support, education, and livelihood programmes addressed the underlying socio-economic drivers of radicalization. These observations align with Jemirade (2020) and UNHCR (2021), who argue that humanitarian interventions serve a preventive security function.

Effective collaboration between security and humanitarian actors scored 3.78 (SD = 0.92), with respondents acknowledging that operational cooperation existed but was often constrained by differences in institutional mandates and professional cultures. Joint forums recorded the lowest mean in this section (3.69, SD = 0.95), with several respondents reporting that inter-agency



meetings were irregular and frequently excluded community representatives. This finding echoes Abdalatif, (2021), who argued that sustained, inclusive coordination mechanisms are essential for building the institutional trust needed for effective collaborative security.

4.4 Challenges in Implementing Border Control Measures

Table 6 summarizes the challenges identified by respondents in implementing effective border control measures. The overall mean of 4.08 signified strong agreement that multiple structural, operational, and social factors significantly impeded border security effectiveness.

Table 6: Challenges in Implementing Border Control Measures (n = 128)

Challenge	Mean	Std. Dev.
Porous borders and vast terrain	4.26	0.73
Limited resources and equipment	4.19	0.79
Inadequate personnel	4.10	0.81
Community mistrust of security agencies	3.97	0.89
Human rights and legal constraints	3.88	0.92
Overall Mean	4.08	

Note. Scale: 1 = Not a Challenge, 5 = Major Challenge.

Porous borders and vast terrain emerged as the most critical challenge (mean = 4.26, SD = 0.73), with respondents indicating that the expansive and difficult landscape made comprehensive monitoring practically impossible. This finding is consistent with analyses of the Horn of Africa security environment, which consistently highlight border porosity as a structural vulnerability exploited by extremist groups (Abdalatif, (2021); Ibrahim and Wario (2022)). Limited resources and equipment ranked second (mean = 4.19, SD = 0.79), with respondents citing shortages of vehicles, communication tools, surveillance technology, and biometric infrastructure as major constraints on operational capacity. Inadequate personnel were similarly prominent (mean = 4.10, SD = 0.81), underscoring the mismatch between available security forces and the scale of the border area requiring coverage.

Community mistrust of security agencies (mean = 3.97, SD = 0.89) and human rights and legal constraints (mean = 3.88, SD = 0.92) were also identified as significant challenges. Respondents noted that historical grievances, perceived discrimination, and fear of victimization discouraged community members from providing information to security agencies. Meanwhile, adherence to international refugee law and humanitarian principles occasionally constrained the speed and

scope of security interventions. These findings resonate with Jemirade (2020) and Kibaara and Muhindi (2025), who documented the inherent tension between security imperatives and humanitarian protection norms in conflict-adjacent refugee contexts.

4.5 Inferential Analysis

4.5.1 Correlation Analysis

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between border control measures and radicalization prevention outcomes. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Pearson Correlation — Border Control Measures and Radicalization Prevention

Variable Relationship	r	p-value
Border Control Measures vs. Radicalization Prevention	0.642	0.000

Note. ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed). $n = 128$.

The analysis revealed a strong positive correlation between border control measures and radicalization prevention ($r = 0.642$, $p < 0.001$). This statistically significant result indicates that improvements in border screening, intelligence sharing, surveillance, community monitoring, and technological operations are strongly associated with enhanced prevention of radicalization. The strength of the coefficient suggests that border control measures account for a substantial proportion of the variation in radicalization prevention outcomes. These findings are consistent with UNODC (2022) and Kotia (2024), who established that coordinated border management systems are critical in disrupting extremist networks and cross-border radicalization flows.

4.5.2 Regression Analysis

OLS regression was performed to determine the extent to which border control measures predicted radicalization prevention outcomes. Table 8 presents the regression coefficients.

Table 8: Linear Regression — Border Control Measures Predicting Radicalization Prevention

Variable	β	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Border Control Measures	0.587	0.072	8.15	0.000
Constant	1.214	0.311	3.90	0.001

Note. $R^2 = 0.412$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.407$. Dependent variable: radicalization prevention outcomes. $n = 128$.

The regression model demonstrated that border control measures significantly predicted radicalization prevention outcomes ($\beta = 0.587$, $SE = 0.072$, $t = 8.15$, $p < 0.001$). The positive beta coefficient indicates that a one-unit increase in the effectiveness of border control operations —



encompassing improved screening, intelligence sharing, patrol surveillance, community monitoring, and technological support — corresponded to an improvement of approximately 0.587 units in radicalization prevention outcomes. The model explained approximately 41.2% of the variance in prevention outcomes ($R^2 = 0.412$), confirming the substantial predictive power of border control measures. The constant term (1.214, $p = 0.001$) represents the baseline level of radicalization prevention in the absence of border control interventions, reinforcing the argument that structural factors outside border management also contribute to counter-radicalization outcomes. Overall, the regression results provide robust empirical evidence that strengthening border control is a key determinant of effective radicalization prevention in the Hagadera Refugee Complex, consistent with the findings of Larkin and Clark (2023) and UNHCR (2021).

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide compelling empirical evidence that border control mechanisms play a significant and measurable role in preventing radicalization within the Hagadera Refugee Complex. The high overall mean scores for border control effectiveness (4.04) and the strong correlation and regression coefficients confirm that intelligence sharing, border screening, and patrol surveillance are not merely procedural activities but constitute a substantive line of defence against extremist infiltration. These results align with Routine Activity Theory, which frames effective guardianship — operationalized here through border control — as a decisive factor in reducing the convergence of motivated offenders and suitable targets.

The moderate to high mean for inter-agency coordination (3.84) suggests that collaboration between security agencies and humanitarian actors contributes positively to radicalization prevention, particularly through information sharing and joint planning. However, the lower scores for joint forums (3.69) and effective collaboration (3.78) indicate that coordination remains inconsistent and institutionally fragile. The findings echo Magwood et al. (2022) and Mutisya (2024), who demonstrated that sustained, formally structured coordination mechanisms produce more durable security outcomes than ad hoc collaboration. The study's finding that humanitarian interventions — including psychosocial support and livelihood programming — contribute to security objectives by addressing root vulnerability factors is particularly significant. It reinforces the argument that in refugee settings, security and humanitarian work are not competing priorities but mutually reinforcing functions.

The challenges identified in this study are sobering. The high mean for border porosity (4.26) and resource limitations (4.19) reflect the structural reality that effective border control in expansive, under-resourced environments requires sustained political will and financial investment that has historically been difficult to secure. The challenge of community mistrust (3.97) is equally important: without the cooperation of the refugee population, border security agencies lose access to a critical and irreplaceable source of threat intelligence. Addressing this trust deficit requires



security agencies to demonstrate cultural sensitivity, restraint, and accountability — values that must be embedded in professional training and operational protocols. These findings collectively align with Oando (2022), who identified resource constraints and the security-rights tension as persistent barriers to counter-terrorism effectiveness in Kenya.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study provides the first systematic empirical assessment of the relationship between border control mechanisms and radicalization prevention in the Hagadera Refugee Complex, addressing a significant gap in the existing literature on security management in East African refugee settings. The findings confirm that border control mechanisms, when properly resourced and coordinated, significantly mitigate radicalization risks — a conclusion supported by both descriptive and inferential evidence.

Based on the findings, five recommendations are advanced. First, the Government of Kenya and security partners should increase investment in border infrastructure, surveillance technology, biometric systems, and personnel capacity specifically for humanitarian border zones such as Hagadera. Second, joint forums between security agencies, humanitarian organizations, and community structures should be formalized, regularly scheduled, and inclusive of all relevant actors to institutionalize coordination rather than relying on informal, ad hoc engagement. Third, community engagement programs should be strengthened to build trust between security agencies and refugee communities, including through participatory monitoring mechanisms, complaint channels, and transparent security protocols. Fourth, policy frameworks must explicitly reconcile security objectives with human rights obligations, providing clear operational guidance that empowers security personnel to act effectively within legal and ethical boundaries. Fifth, multi-stakeholder resource mobilization — including contributions from development partners, regional bodies, and the international community — should be prioritized to sustain border security operations in under-resourced humanitarian contexts.

Future research should examine the long-term impact of integrated border control and community engagement strategies on radicalization recruitment over time, assess the cost-effectiveness and operational integration of emerging surveillance technologies in refugee settings, and explore the psychosocial pathways through which displacement and socio-economic marginalization shape vulnerability to extremist recruitment.

7. REFERENCES

- Abdalatif, F. A. (2021). *In Search of Home; Child Soldiers in al-Shabaab's Ranks*.
<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1593564&dswid=-1659>



- Amomo, C. G. (2024). A cybersecurity and regulatory framework for mitigating fraud and illicit activity in cryptocurrency ecosystems. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, 12(2), 1002–1019.
<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2024.12.2.0294>
- Badurdeen, F. A. (2024, March 12). *Cross-border Dynamics in Terrorist Mobility and Infiltration along the East African Coastlines*. Ifri.org.
<https://www.ifri.org/en/studies/cross-border-dynamics-terrorist-mobility-and-infiltration-along-east-african-coastlines>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive Sampling: Complex or Simple? Research Case Examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Eashae, K. (2025). *How Can Community-Led Initiatives Build Social Cohesion and Support Attempts to Prevent Violent Extremism in Aotearoa New Zealand?*
<https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.29176724>
- Elvegard, R., Andreassen, N., & Badu, J. (2024). Building collaboration and trust in emergency preparedness: a model for planning collaboration exercises. *Safety in Extreme Environments*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42797-024-00107-w>
- Guldimann, A., & Meloy, J. R. (2020). Assessing the threat of lone-actor terrorism: the reliability and validity of the TRAP-18. *Forensische Psychiatrie, Psychologie, Kriminologie*, 14(2), 158–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11757-020-00596-y>
- Hansen, S., Lid, S., Collins, C., & Okwany, O. (2022). *Countering violent extremism in Somalia and Kenya: Actors and approaches*. <https://www.cve-kenya.org/media/library/oslomet.pdf>
- Hussey, I., Alsalti, T., Bosco, F., Elson, M., & Arslan, R. (2025). An Aberrant Abundance of Cronbach's Alpha Values at .70. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459241287123>
- Ibrahim, H. A., & Wario, H. A. (2022). Understanding the Role of Community-Based Organisations in Radicalisation and Terror-Related Activities in Nairobi County, Kenya. *East African Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 162–175.
<https://doi.org/10.37284/eajass.5.2.958>
- Jemirade, D. (2020). Humanitarian intervention (HI) and the responsibility to protect (R2P): the United Nations and international security. *African Security Review*, 30(1), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10246029.2020.1847153>
- Kibaara, A., & Muhindi, S. (2025). Terrorism Consequences on Human Security in Nairobi County, Kenya. *Cradle of Knowledge: African Journal of Educational and Social Science Research (The)*, 12(2), 63–68. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajessr.v12i2.2>
- Kithii, N. N., & Onyango, E. (2023). Impacts of Using Multi Agency Command Centre Strategy



- on National Security at Isebania Trans-Border, Migori County, Kenya. *OAlib*, 10(09), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1110566>
- Kotia, E. (2024). *Building Border Community Resilience Against Violent Extremism: The Role Of The Ghana Boundary Commission*. <https://emmakotia.org/download/26/policy-brief/4159/ghbc-october-article.pdf>
- Larkin, L. L., & Clark, S. A. (2023, November 21). *Refugees Flexing Social Power as Agents of Stability: Creating Modes of Economic Livelihoods in Kenya's Camps*. Dtic.mil. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/trecms/AD1049211/>
- Magwood, O., Kassam, A., Mavedatnia, D., Mendonca, O., Saad, A., Hasan, H., Madana, M., Ranger, D., Tan, Y., & Pottie, K. (2022). Mental Health Screening Approaches for Resettling Refugees and Asylum Seekers: A Scoping Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(6), 3549. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063549>
- Mutisya, M. (2024). Challenges and Lessons Learned from Counter Terrorism Strategies in Kenya. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(1), 225–230. <https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.5.1.22>
- Oando, S. O. (2022). *Space for African women in tackling violent extremism: Engendering conflict transformation in Kenya*. <https://hdl.handle.net/10523/13506>
- Oyosi, E. O. (2024, November). *Security Measures and Border Security at Namanga One Stop Border Post, Kajiado County, Kenya*. Ku.ac.ke. <https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/items/1e1db030-530d-4663-aab0-f5ec691a5d38>
- Sempijja, N., & Nkosi, B. (2021). National Counter-Terrorism (C-T) Policies and Challenges to Human Rights and Civil Liberties: Case Study of Kenya. *International Human Rights*, 431–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4181-5_36
- Shafieioun, D., & Haq, H. (2023). Radicalization from a societal perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1197282. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1197282>
- Shinija, Mrs. N. Adlin. (2024). DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH DESIGN. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19205.36325>
- Sydnese, M., Kjeve, M., & Sydnese, A. K. (2025). Interorganizational coordination during emergencies and crises. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 105310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2025.105310>
- Tseer, T., Kuusaana, E. D., Fuseini, M. N., Yiridomoh, G. Y., & Salifu, K. (2025). From policing to sustainability: Rethinking pathways for safer neighbourhoods in border communities. *World Development Sustainability*, 7, 100230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2025.100230>
- United Nations. (2019). *United Nations Somalia Together for Development Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism P/Cve At A Glance*. <https://somalia.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/PCVE.PDF>