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Foreword

Kasese District aspires to achieve socio-economic development through efficient provision of quality services to the people in conformity with national and local priorities. The District has also set its vision: achieving ‘a poverty free society by 2025’. In view of that commitment, the District is privileged to be supported by the Belgium Government through the Belgo Uganda Study Fund.

The District benefited from the Poverty Profiling and Mapping Study which was conducted in Kasese District, between February and December 2011, and whose objectives were: at the national level, to enrich and strengthen the capacity of the Government of Uganda and its development partners to design more effective poverty reduction programmes for the district. At the district level, to identify the incidence and prevalence of poverty in the district; locate the groups that are regarded as poor including the marginalized groups; and describe and categorize the poor in social economic clusters, as well as in geographical space.

From the Poverty Profiling and Mapping Study findings, a number of poverty indicators relating to education, health, production etc. in all Sub Counties were analysed and a number of recommendations made as a way forward. There is no doubt that the Poverty Report will guide future participatory planning processes both at the district and Lower Local Government levels.

On that note I wish to thank the district political leaders and the technical staff led by the Chief Administrative Officer, the District Planning Unit and the Sub County leadership for the work done. In addition our development partners led by the Kasese District Poverty Reduction Programme supported by the Belgium Technical Cooperation for their technical input and financial support during the entire process of planning for and executing the Poverty Study in Kasese.

The Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development played a key role in as far the overall leadership and guidance of the Poverty Study was concerned. The District will forever be thankful to the Belgium Government, through the Belgo-Ugandan Study and Consultancy Fund, for the financial support which enabled the district and its partners to accomplish all tasks related to the Poverty Profiling and Mapping Study.

Lastly my thanks to the team that wrote the final report led by Daniela Calvi Renno.

Lt. Col. Mawa Muhindo (Retired)
District Chairperson
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<tr>
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<td>Kasese District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Local Council</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNV</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBOS</td>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>Ugandan Shillings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Universal Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA</td>
<td>Village Saving and Loans Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Kasese District’s vision is of ‘a poverty free society by 2025’. In order to achieve this, a number of development plans and initiatives have been and continue to be implemented throughout the district. One such activity was the Poverty Profiling and Mapping (PPM) survey, conducted by Kasese District in partnership with the Kasese District Poverty Reduction Programme of the Belgian Technical Cooperation.

The PPM exercise, one of the most extensive district surveys in the country with more than 9,500 households interviewed, was envisaged as a tool to improve pro-poor planning and budgeting of local government. Since it is through a better understanding of the interconnected and complex nature of poverty in the district that effective solutions can best formulated, the survey adopted a holistic approach concerning poverty, looking at a broad spectrum of different aspects, affecting household welfare and contributing to poverty. Two composite indices, the wealth index and the deprivation index, were developed and use to ascertain who the poor and most deprived households are, where they are located and how easily they access public infrastructure, services and development programmes. With limited financial capacity within the district to combat poverty, the effective planning and allocation of existing resources is vital. As such, the findings outlined in this report are relevant both to district level planning, and at the lower local government (LLG) level. Utilising the findings of this survey, lower government departments, as well as individual LLGs, can detail action plans to address the concerns of this report and improve their targeting of the poor in planning and budgeting.

This PPM report presents the survey’s findings in a clear and logical framework, with individual areas of focus dealt with sequentially. Within each area of focus the survey’s findings are reported both numerically and in narrative form. Recommendations are included in the final chapter. The areas of focus are as follows:

- Who and where are the poor
- Livelihoods
- Food availability and nutrition
- Education
- Health
- Vulnerable groups
- Governance.

The most significant findings and recommendations of each of the areas of focus of this report are summarised below. However, two key aspects, which impact in multiple ways household welfare and poverty levels within the district, are worth highlighted: population growth and land.

With an annual population growth rate of 3.6%, Kasese District’s population is expected to double every twenty years, this despite Kasese’s unique geography, which limits the available land for human habitation and productive use. Moreover, the natural resource base of the district, particularly land, is already being overexploited, in part due to rapid population growth, and it is suggested that, if degradation continues, the land’s biological potential may be permanently reduced and the welfare of district resident’s may deteriorate (KDLG, 2005). Survey findings suggest that 64.4% of households report that land conflicts have increase in the last 5 years, and the future trends look set to rise as the population continues to grow and livelihoods compete for the available resources. Furthermore, the district’s capacity to provide public infrastructure and services to a rapidly growing population may well be threatened beyond its ability to cope. Added to this, is the challenge of large numbers of youth entering the job market every year. Given the
limited opportunities of finding formal employment, emphasis must be on preparing the youth to be economically productive, by supporting and improving vocational training opportunities, and by enabling them to access the financial means necessary to engage in and expand eventual economic activities.

Without addressing issues of land use management in a cohesive way and without an earnest and deliberate embrace of population issues by political leaders and planners meeting the district’s vision is likely to remain an unattainable goal.

Summary of LLGs poverty hotspot

The table below is a summary of the top 6 LLGs with the highest percentage district concentration of households in a number of categories, used throughout this report, to indicate poverty status, susceptibility to poverty or hardship in terms of access to public infrastructure or service delivery.

Table 0.1: LLGs with highest HH concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOP 6 LLGS WITH HIGHEST PERCENTAGE CONCENTRATION OF HOUSEHOLDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most extremely poor HHs</strong></td>
<td>Kitswamba Muhokya Kitholhu Lake Katwe Hima Karusandara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most severely deprived HHs</strong></td>
<td>Munkunyu Nyakiyumbo Bugoye Bwera Kyarumba Ihandiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs experiencing wealth decline</strong></td>
<td>Muhokya Kyondo Munkunyu Kitswamba Lake Katwe Kyarumba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest hardship ranking</strong></td>
<td>Bwesumbu Kyarumba Mahango Kyabarungira Buhuhira Ihandiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs with very poor quality roads to market</strong></td>
<td>Nyakiyumbo Mahango Bugoye Munkunyu Karusandara Kyondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHs with smallest average land holdings</strong></td>
<td>Katwe Kabatoro Mpondwe Lhubiriha Bwera Kyarumba Isango Karambi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHs with lowest average land value</strong></td>
<td>Mahango Muhokya Kilembe Ihandiro Isango Kyarumba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fewest HHs receiving an extension visit</strong></td>
<td>Bulembia division Nyamwamba division Katwe Kabatoro Hima Central division Rukoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs failing to obtain credit</strong></td>
<td>Bugoye Kitswamba Kitholhu Kisinga Kilembe Isango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHs with fewest average meals x day</strong></td>
<td>Munkunyu Nyakiyumbo Lake Katwe Karusandara Katwe Kabatoro Mahango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs experiencing severe food shortages</strong></td>
<td>Kisinga Kitswamba Kyarumba Lake Katwe Ihandiro Munkunyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHs with longest average distance to UPE school</strong></td>
<td>Lake Katwe Buhuhira Kyarumba Kitswamba Munkunyu Bwesumbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHs with longest average distance to USE school</strong></td>
<td>Buhuhira Rukoki Bwesumbu Lake Katwe Bugoye Kyarumba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs with child school absenteeism</strong></td>
<td>Bugoye Lake Katwe Kitswamba Munkunyu Bwera Bwesumbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most HHs with girls missing more school than boys</strong></td>
<td>Bwesumbu Kyarumba Lake Katwe Kyabarungira Kitswamba Kyondo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category: Top 6 LLGs with Highest Percentage Concentration of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Top 6 LLGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most HHs with school dropouts</td>
<td>Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Kyondo, Kyarumba, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most HHs with members who never attended school</td>
<td>Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bwesumbu, Buhuhira, Bugoye, Kyabarungira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most HHs with very poor quality health facilities</td>
<td>Bwesumbu, Bugoye, Mahango, Maliba, Nyakiyumbu, Munkunyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most HHs travelling more than 5 kms to health facility</td>
<td>Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Kyondo, Lake Katwe, Mahango, Rukoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewest HHs participating in LLG plan and budget</td>
<td>Hima, Nyamwamba division, Kitholhu, Kyondo, Bulembia division, Mahango</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen above, the LLGs which consistently have larger percentages of households in the various categories are Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Lake Katwe, Nyakiyumbu, Bwesumbu, Kitswamba, Bugoye, Mahango, Kyondo, Buhuhira, Muhokya and Katwe Kabatoro. As such, it can be said that the households in these LLGs are more likely to be vulnerable to poverty and most likely to encounter hardships in accessing public infrastructure and services. Though initiative to reduce poverty should not be limited to these LLG, identifying them as containing the most vulnerable households can help focus future planning.

### Who and where are the poor

Understanding who the poor are, what causes them to be poor, and which areas within the district have the highest density of poorer and more deprived households is critical in formulating strategies to alleviate the poverty. Despite positive development efforts throughout the district, poverty still remains an issue in Kasese, with 55.2% of households being either ‘moderately poor’ or ‘extremely poor’. The highest percentage concentration of ‘extremely poor’ households are found in the LLGs of Kitswamba, Muhokya, Kitholhu, Lake Katwe, Hima, Karusandara, Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Katwe Kabatoro, Nyamwamba and Bulembia divisions. Moreover, survey results show that 28.7% of households not able to satisfy 3 or more basic needs out of the 5 identified (see deprivation index in Appendix 3 for more details), and critically, 3.2% of households are deprived in all five areas of the deprivation index, indicating an extreme inability to afford basic household needs. The LLG with the highest density of severely deprived households are Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bugoye, Bwera, Kyarumba, Ihandiro, Maliba, Kyondo, Hima, Isango and Mpondwe Lhubiriha. Some of the main causes of poverty cited are land shortage, laziness or idleness, alcoholism, lack of employment or productive opportunities and lack of access to credit facilities.

Location, livelihood, education and the marital status of household heads all have an impact on the wealth and deprivation status of households in the district. Poor households (‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’) tend to live rurally, engage in petty livelihoods, and their household heads are likely to be less educated, and more frequently singles, divorcees or widows.

Almost half of the district’s residents have perceived a decline in wealth over the past 5 years (47.3% of households), most notably poor households and those with the most deprivations. This is predominantly due to high commodity prices/inflation, lack of capital, food shortage/drought and illness. In percentage terms, the LLGs with the most households experiencing wealth deterioration in last 5 years are Muhokya, Kyondo, Munkunyu, Kitswamba, Lake Katwe, Kyarumba, Nyakiyumbu, Kisinga, Nyamwamba division and Ihandiro.
Most public services are poorly rated by households, with the exception of primary schools and health, which received more satisfactory ratings. The legal system (87.8% of households), power supply (76.8%), land administration and adjudication (75.0%) and credit (61.5%) are ranked the most unsatisfactory by households. The latter are particularly worrying given that land shortages and limited access to credit are significant contributing factors to poverty in the district. Bwesumbu, Kyarumba, Mahango, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira, Ihandiro, Kitholhu, Kyondo, Maliba and Karusandara have the highest hardship ranking score, meaning it is more difficult for households in these LLGs to access public infrastructure and services. However, findings suggest that LLGs with higher hardship ranking scores do not also have higher concentrations of 'extremely poor' households, signifying that difficult access to public infrastructure and services does not necessarily have a significant impact on whether households are poor or not. Poverty is multifaceted and depends also on a number of other contributing factors.

Livelihoods

The ability of a household to generate income impinges on the household’s level of poverty. This survey has found that households from poor wealth groups ('extremely poor' and 'moderately poor' households) and with severe deprivations (that is experiencing all 5 deprivations listed in the appendix) mainly engage in crop farming. However, these households own on average between 0.02 and 1.2 acres of land, which is insufficient to sustain household needs. In addition, 86.7% of subsistence cultivators indicate that their yields have decreased over the last 20 years, due to soil exhaustion, pests and diseases and unpredictable weather patterns. In addition, 71.2% of pastoralists state that grazing land is not enough and 80% indicate that the availability of water for livestock is poor, resulting in 50.0% of pastoralists report a decrease in productivity per head over the last 5 years. The picture for households involved in capture fishing is even bleaker. 70.0% of capture fishermen report a decline in fish stocks over the past 5 years, yet efforts to sustain fish resources through regulation of poor fishing practices are resisted and, due to the restricted location of capture fishing villages, few alternative livelihoods are available.

Only 10% of subsistence crop farmers report using modern agricultural technologies and only 6.7% of pastoralists suggest owning exotic or cross breeds of cattle, highlighting areas of focus for considerable improvement of household livelihoods. This requires improvements to the accessibility and quality of extension services, especially since survey findings indicate that both government and CSO extension services fail to reach large percentages of the population, particularly poor households, and that the majority of households ranked extension services poorly, with fisheries receiving the highest unsatisfactory rating (75.5%). Extension services need to be expanded and strengthened, with emphasis not only on technical and physical support, but also on on-going sensitisation of the community so as to improve productivity through the transformation of agricultural practices.

Secondary sources of income also play a significant part in improving the economic situation of households and, where possible, emphasis should be on enhancing livelihood diversification. However, survey findings indicate that 53.9% of 'extremely poor' households and 54.9% of 'moderately poor' ones were unsuccessful in gaining loans to either expand or set-up income generating enterprises or meet household expenditure. Households involved in crop farming, capture fishing, services, animal husbandry and other petty livelihoods particularly struggled to obtain loans. Survey findings indicate that Bugoye, Kitswamba, Kitholhu, Kisinga, Kilembe, Isango, Muhokya, Bwera, Nyakiyumbu and Munkunyu have the highest concentration of households who did not succeed in obtaining required credit. Improving access to savings and credit services will play a key part in enabling household to save and acquire more productive assets, so as to safeguard against shocks and risks and boost their economic activities.
Food availability and nutrition

A well-fed population is healthier and more productive. The two components to achieving this are the availability of food and the nutritional content food consumed. This survey has found a somewhat worrying picture of food insecurity in the district. It has identified that 54.6% of households experience food shortages during one or more seasons and that, more alarmingly, 8.3% of households are food insecure during all four seasons. Kisinga, Kitswamba, Kyarumba, Lake Katwe, Ihindiro, Munkunyu, Central division, Muhokya, Bwera and Mahango have the highest percentage concentration of households experiencing food shortages during all seasons. Consumption of meals per day is on a sliding scale with ‘wealthy’ and non-deprived households consuming on average 2.6 and 2.7 meals respectively and ‘extremely poor’ and severely deprived household consuming only 2.0 meals per day on average. Households in Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Lake Katwe, Karusandara, Katwe Kabatoro, Mahango, Isango, Bwera, Hima and Ihindiro on average consume fewer meals per day.

Findings suggest that the size of land available to households has a direct impact of food security; the larger the available household land holding, the lower the prevalence of food shortages. This is a concerning fact given the shortage of land and the rapidly growing district population. The nutritional value of household meals is also a cause for concern. Consumption of nutritionally high foods is low with meat or fish being consumed on average 1.9 times per week.

The primary way to combat this combination of food availability and poor dietary intake is through a multi-sectoral approach, with production, health and educations services sensitising the community to the importance of more nutritionally balanced meals and advocating for better farming methods, which can increase yields and the available food for consumption.

Education

Education plays a vital role in development. This study has shown a correlation between poverty and the educational level of household heads; poor households tend to have less educated household heads. Conversely, the higher the educational level of the household head the more likely the household is to be better-off.

The district has a major role in providing education since 70% of households indicate sending their children to UPE and USE schools. However, compared to private schools, government educational facilities are poorly rated. Moreover, current education infrastructure is not sufficient to meet the needs of the growing district population. With insufficient teachers, classroom materials, latrine stances, staff houses and with many households travelling more than 5 kms to reach the nearest government secondary school, providing quality education to the young district population is a significant challenge. Pupil absenteeism and dropout rates are an additional hindrance to receiving quality education. On average, children attend school 4.8 days per week. However, Bugoye, Lake Katwe, Kitswamba, Munkunyu, Kitswamba, Bwera, Bwesumbu, Isango, Ihindiro and Buhuhira have the highest percentage density of households reporting child absenteeism. The main reasons given for child absenteeism are unpaid school fees, sickness, lack of scholastic materials, seasonal work, household or farming chores and lack of interest.

29.5% of households indicate that at least one child in the household has dropped out of school in the last 6 years. 98.6% of households with severe deprivations have had at least one child dropout of school. The highest percentage concentration of households in with children have dropped out of school are found in Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Kyondo, Kyarumba, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira, Bwesumbu, Muhokya, Kitswamba and Hima. These findings point to economic factors influencing educational decisions, but also to poor attitudes towards education, both by parents and children alike. Furthermore, 28.5% of households report that one or more members of the household have
never attended school. This is particularly true for poor households, and in Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bwesumbu, Buhuhira, Bugoye, Kyabarungira, Kitswamba, Rukoki, Mahango and Muhokya which have the highest percentage density of households reporting failure to educate one or more household members. These results represent a worrying reality, given the aforementioned link between the educational levels of household heads and a household’s wealth status. By failing to educate household members, these poorer households are likely to perpetuate the cycle of poverty.

With limited funds to increase the provision of schools, teachers and scholastic materials, efforts should be directed at improving the quality of education by ensuring improved supervision and by maximising the effectiveness of teachers and teaching methods. Moreover, poor attitudes towards education and cost factors, most often associated with absenteeism and poor school attendance, need to be addressed, alongside initiatives to strengthen household saving and income earning capabilities so as to empower households to meet their financial responsibilities for education.

Health

Good heath is central to having a productive workforce, and healthcare provision is vital to the welfare of the community. The importance of government health institutions is seen in the findings of this study which indicate that 76.7% of households attend the nearest government health facility. Households in the poorer wealth groups and with more deprivations are those who are most reliant on government health facilities, yet they have to travel further to reach the nearest facility. According to the study, 87.7% of households who travel more than 5 kms to the nearest health facility belong to the poor wealth groups compared to just 12.3% of households from the better-off wealth groups. A higher percentage concentration of households in Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Kyondo, Lake Katwe, Mahango, Rukoki, Nyakiyumbu, Maliba, Buhuhira and Bwesumbu travel more than 5 kms to access the nearest health facilities. In terms of the perceived quality of service delivery, poorer households are slightly more critical of the quality of healthcare received, perhaps because they are unable to afford other alternatives. Bwesumbu, Bugoye, Mahango, Maliba, Nyakiyumbu, Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Buhuhira, Rukoki and Karusandara have the highest percentage density of households who believe the quality of the nearest health facilities is very poor.

Given that the poor are more likely to succumb to ill-health and yet are less likely to easily access or afford quality medical treatment, efforts to strengthen and improve healthcare should be poverty. In view of the financial constraints on expanding and equipping health facilities, efforts should be directed at preventive healthcare, with particular emphasis on sanitation and hygiene, family planning and maternal child health. Moreover, since cost is often associated with limited uptake of health services, the expansion of programmes to increase the income earning opportunities of the poor (e.g. savings and credit groups, selective enterprise) are encouraged.

Vulnerable groups

A number of vulnerable groups present throughout the district are covered in this report. This survey has sought to identify the most pressing challenges of each group in order that relevant and tailored strategies can be developed and implemented.

The elderly

Due to the breakdown of the traditionally protective structures the elderly are often left particularly exposed to poverty. Low income, followed by ill-health, food shortages, neglect by relatives and payment of school fees are the main challenges faced by the elderly. 86.7% of elderly
people consider themselves to be ‘poor’ or ‘extremely poor’, and 90.0% of them believe their economic situation had deteriorated in the past 5 years. Many elderly people now face an economically insecure future; instead of the traditional family unit caring for them, many are forced to look after dependents, for example grandchildren or disabled relatives, placing increased burdens on their limited finances and often necessitating that they engage in petty economic activities so as to meet basic needs. 69.2% of elderly people perceive the community’s attitude towards them to be negative, resulting in the elderly being isolated from the very social structures and norms meant to support them, heightening their vulnerability.

**PWD**

Though positive developments in the well-being of PWDs in Kasese have been recorded, with 44.8% of PWDs suggest their economic situation over the past 5 years has improved, people with disabilities face tremendous challenges. Lack of appropriate income generating activities and unequal access to public services have thwarted their earning abilities, and rendered them susceptible to poverty. Furthermore, though formation of and participation in PWD support groups has flourished, with 73.3% of PWDs indicating membership of a support group, discriminatory attitudes towards PWDs still hampered their competitiveness in the job market, and isolated them due to social stigma.

**Young people**

Given the fundamentally youthful structure of the growing population in Kasese, the vulnerabilities of young people cannot be ignored. With poor educational achievements, limited vocational training and economic opportunities, and limited access to family planning and reproductive health programmes, young people face tremendous challenges to their current and future well-being. Moreover, the youth are no longer able to reply on the productive resource of land, with 63.1% of young people reporting that they are not sure whether they will inherit land from their parents, either due to insufficient land to be divided among many children or to parental disinterest. The youth surveyed indicate that because of poor parental guidance, and lack of school fees or productive opportunities, they are idle leading to unwanted pregnancies, early marriage, risky exposure to HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases, and to anti-social behaviour (e.g. alcoholism, drug abuse) and crime.

**Child-headed households**

Child-headed households face some of the most severe hardships. 85.4% of child-headed households believe themselves to be ‘poor’ or ‘extremely poor’. 71.4% say their economic situation, over the past 5 years, has worsened. Caught between childhood and the responsibilities of managing a household, these children, more often than not, lack the income opportunities and resources to adequately meet the basic needs of their households. Reliant mostly on others, child-headed households are vulnerable to poor health, food insecurity and to abuse. With little hope of attaining a high educational standard their chances of future productive employment are slight. Hopelessness in the face of such difficulties is often a feature of such households, with well over ¼ of respondents suggested they have no means of coping with the challenges they face. The breakdown of the traditional protective social systems has further rendered this population group extremely vulnerable to poverty and exploitation.

**Women and female-headed households**

Unequal power relations, resulting in women’s dependence on men for decision making, ownership and control over household assets and income, greatly hampers women’s involvement in productive activities and restricts their contribution to economic development. Furthermore, in spite of efforts to address this issue, low educational attainments among women further render them susceptible to unemployment or underemployment and poor standards of living. This can be
seen in the fact that 42% of women in the district are literate, compared to 52% of men. Households headed by singles, divorcées and widows are more likely to be poor, which highlights the particular susceptibility of female-headed households to hardships and poverty. The main challenges faced by women and female-headed households are low earning due to limited access to income generating opportunities, not being productively employed, being economically dependent on others, owning limited or no land, shouldering many different responsibilities, having limited control over productive assets and limited decision-making powers.

**PLWHA**

Stigma and discrimination towards people living with HIV and AIDS is the single most significant challenge PLWHA face in the district, with 42.9% of PLWHA indicating that attitudes towards them are negative. Despite the high incidences of HIV and AIDS in Kasese, poor attitudes towards PLWHA lead to secrecy about the disease, hindering prevention and treatment efforts, generate a sense of isolation among PLWHA, and hamper their opportunities to be economically productive. The knock-on effect of stigma and discrimination on PLWHA’s earning capacity cannot be underestimated, and results in a cycle of rejection/isolation, low earnings and ill-health. The necessary medical assistance needed for PLWHA is also a challenge. For those on an ARV programme 47.6% of PLWHA indicate difficulties in access the required drugs, while for those not on ARVs suggest the main reasons for non-usage are lack of drugs and drugs not yet required.

Vulnerable groups, such as the elderly and child-headed households, would benefit from social protection programmes, but given the financial investment and sustainability inherent in these programmes, their implementation may represent a long-term aspiration rather than a current goal. Participation in organised support groups, such as PWD support groups, post-test clubs, youth groups or VSLAs, when managed well, have proven to provide not only psychosocial support, but also physical and technical support. Thus efforts to encourage formation of these groups should be encouraged, with particular emphasis on the provision of savings and credit services and access to vocational training opportunities. Further research is also required to better-understand these vulnerable segments of the population, with particular attention on child-headed households, the youth and the elderly.

**Governance**

Though structures and systems are in place to facilitate effective governance at local level, district residents lack confidence in their leaders both to utilise funds allocated to development effectively, and to be transparent and accountable in the use of such funds, weakening development efforts. The vast majority of households do not know how LLG funds allocated for development are spent (89.8%), and 47.9% of households do not believe allocated funds are well spent, compared to 33.4% who do. Moreover, the majority of households do not know whether their LLG plan and budget is pro-poor (52.3%). 38.8% of households do not consider their LLG plan and budget to be pro-poor while only 8.9% believe it is. Pro-poor elements include NAADS and infrastructure development, whereas the main pro-poor element missing was the provision of low interest credit.

This survey has highlighted a perceived difficulty among households to both input into the decision making process, and to attain information about development programmes. The majority of households have never participated in LLG planning and budgeting of public resources (69.7%), with a mere 3.0% said they were active in their participation. Women are particularly marginalised from the process with 96.7% of women suggest that they do not participate. Hima, Nyamwamba division, Kitholhu, Kyondo, Bulembia division, Mahango, Central division, Karambi, Kyarumba and Rukoki have the lowest percentage concentration of households participating in the LLG plan and budget. Furthermore, there is a disconnection between words and action in terms of community involvement in poverty reduction. While 82% of households believe the community plays an active
role in reducing poverty, only 43.9% of households have contributed to a community project in their area. This may be exacerbated by the information gap between the populace and local government and CSOs about development planning, implementation and budgets. 53.9% of respondents found it difficult to directly access information about development programmes, while 11.6% suggested they had no direct access to such information.

In conjunction with LC1s, radio has been identified by this survey as the most useful tool in disseminating information. A such, efforts should be made to strengthened these channels and encourage their use not only as tools for community participation, but also for improved accountability with regards to the implementation of and allocation of funds to such programmes. Moreover, efforts to ensure that pro-poor elements are not only included in LLG plans and budgets, but also effectively communicated to the wider community should be stepped-up.
Introduction

Aim of the report

According to a study, entitled *Spatial Trends of Poverty and Inequality in Uganda 2002/2005* (UBOS, 2008), rural poverty in Kasese District in 2005 stood at 48%. While this reflects a welcome improvement from 52% in 1992, it is higher than the national average of 31%. Despite relative security in recent times and sustained development programmes, a study on perceptions of poverty conducted in 2009, by the District Planning Unit and Belgian Technical Cooperation, revealed that 55% of respondents believed poverty to have increased over the last five years. Furthermore, about 86% of respondents attributed this increase to the high rate of population growth, with fears that the situation would worsen in the future.

These worrying findings, coupled with a lack of information at district level about who the poor are and where they are located, presents a particular challenge to local policy makers in designing and targeting poverty reduction programmes and resources.

As a result, the Kasese District Poverty Reduction Programme, the second phase of the Belgium Technical Cooperation assistance to Kasese District, recommended that the district undertake a comprehensive poverty profiling and mapping study to establish the extent of poverty among the people of Kasese and to propose key strategic interventions for poverty reduction. The PPM exercise was launched in Kasese District in 2011. The results of the analysis of information gathered throughout the survey are captured in this report.

The aim of this report is to identify who the poor are in Kasese, and highlight any poverty ‘hotspots’ either geographically, within livelihood categories or among particular population groups. Exploration of possible threats, causes and effects of poverty will also help gain a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity of poverty within the district.

The report further aims to be a practical tool for local government planning and budgeting. A better understanding of poverty in Kasese will enable improved allocation of resources to poverty reduction initiatives, through more accurate targeting of the poor. Moreover, detailed information on the distribution of the poor will also assist policy makers, implementers and development partners, at district and LLG level, to strengthen existing poverty interventions or to design specific pro-poor policies and programmes.

Scope of the report

The report covers the analysis of poverty, and a number of other related issues, across the entire district of Kasese. Due to Kasese’s geographic peculiarities, the report covers communities within the district’s highlands, lowlands and intermediate terrains, as well as those involved in the district’s distinct livelihood activities of highland and lowland farming, capture fishing, cattle keeping and trading.

The material is predominantly statistical, generate through quantitative surveys, though stakeholders’ perceptions of poverty have also been drawn upon, through qualitative approaches. A total of 9275 quantitative household questionnaires were conducted, distributed across all of the 28 lower local government administrative units, which make up Kasese District. In addition, 239 qualitative questionnaire interviews were held with stakeholders from the main livelihood
categories present throughout the district, as well as with those representing some of the more vulnerable population groups in Kasese, including the elderly, the youth, people with disabilities, people living with HIV and AIDS, as well as female and child-headed households. Finally, a number of focus group discussions were held with the various vulnerable groups and with key stakeholders at lower local government level. A mix of random and subjective sampling criteria was used to select the parishes, villages and households to be interviewed. Appendix 1 contains more detailed information about the research methodology.

Unfortunately, the writing of the report encountered some constraints. Not all the qualitative data gathered during the study was available at the time of report writing. This limited access to qualitative information somewhat restricted the depth of the analysis of people’s perceptions. In particular, the perspective of political, administrative, religious and community leaders at LLG level is missing. Furthermore, some of the district data, used for secondary purposes, was either unavailable or inaccessible, limiting the accuracy of some of the evidence given.

Measuring poverty

It is widely understood that poverty is multidimensional in nature, and can be measured in a number of different ways. In an attempt to get as comprehensive a picture as possible, this study explores both quantitative and qualitative measures of poverty.

A wealth index enables the categorisation of households into wealth groups. This provides a baseline from which to measure household poverty in the district, and from which to analyse a household’s wealth status against a number of other indicators of well-being. Moreover, it also enables a broader examination of household poverty within geographical and livelihood categories. Further information about the wealth index is found in Appendix 2.

Household deprivation, based on the household’s ability to satisfy certain basic needs, is measured using the household deprivation index. This helps to measure a household’s well-being based on their ability to afford soap, shoes, clothes, sugar and education. The measure determines how many and which households are considered deprived and to what extent their well-being is jeopardy. Appendix 3 outlines the deprivation index in more detail.

Other dimensions of well-being such as good health and education, access to other public services and freedom of participation in social and development activities are also considered in this report using a variety of indicators. Each chapter outlines the various approach taken and indicators used to measure poverty and well-being.

In order to capture the less statistically quantifiable dimensions of poverty, this report draws heavily on respondents’ own perceptions of a number of poverty related issues. Insights into households’ self-assessment of their own and their community’s wealth status, causes and effect of poverty, the shocks that cause vulnerability, and their recommendations for potential poverty reduction programmes have all be incorporated in the report.

Case studies illustrate particular issues, and help to personalise the issues discussed by putting a human face to them.
Chapter 1:

Overview of Kasese District

Kasese’s population overview

The population of Kasese has continued to grow steadily over the years and, at the current growth rate of 3.6%, the population is projected to double every 20 years. At the last census in 2002 the district population stood at 523,033 yet according to district population projections, by 2022, it is estimated that the population of Kasese District will have increased to 1,087,133 people.

![Chart 1.1: Historical and projected population](source: KDLG, 2012)

Kasese District has a youthful population. Figures from the 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census: Kasese District Report (UBOS, 2005) suggests that 57.5% of the population are under the age of 18. Such a large young population not only requires significant investment in social services particularly education and health, but presents considerable challenges in terms of job creation. Moreover, a large proportion of young people, upon reaching reproductive age, will add to the already rising numbers, ensuring the district’s population will continue to grow for one or two generations to come.
A youthful population also means that the dependency ratio in the district is high, with one dependent per 0.95 economically active persons (KDLG, 2009a). At the current growth rates in Uganda, it is suggested that by 2030 the dependency ratio could be three dependent children to every working-age adult (Population Reference Bureau, 2010). This has major implications for socio-economic development, as more resources will be channelled away from saving and investment towards providing for an economically inactive and dependent population.

The district’s population is predominantly rural. Approximately 75.8% of the population, some 558,612 people live in rural LLGs, with well under a quarter of the population living in urban administrative units. Moreover, women make up 51.8% of the district’s population.

Though the native Bakonzo (87%), Banyabindi (1.1%) and Basongora (1%) represent the largest proportion of the district’s population (89.1%), a number of other tribes are also present, including
among others the Batooro, Banyankole, Bakiga, Bafumbira, Baganda, Banyarwanda, Acholi and Batwa (UBOS, 2005). The multi-ethnic nature of the district is due, in large part, to the industry and tourism opportunities, which have historically attracted migrant workers to the area.

**Kasese’s administrative structure and geography**

Kasese District is one of 111 districts in Uganda (MLG, 2010). The district is divided into two counties, Bukonzo and Busongora, and is made up of 28 lower local governments. These include one municipal council split into three divisions, 3 town councils and 22 sub counties.

Located in the Western region, bordering the districts of Kabarole, Bundibugyo, Kamwenge and Bushenyi and the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kasese District covers a surface area of 3,389.6 sq. kms, of which only 1,076.6 sq. kms (37%) is land available for habitation and cultivation, as the greater percentage of land area is occupied by water bodies, wildlife conservation areas, nature or forest reserves as well as government projects such as irrigation schemes and prison farms (KDLG, 2005).

In view of this, the population of Kasese District is concentrated in a narrow corridor of land running between the Rwenzori Mountains and the Western Rift Valley. Considerable pressure is placed on the available land to sustain the current growing population, and also on restricted land to be opened up for future use.

The map shows the narrow strip (dark red) of usable land for human habitation and cultivation, highlighting the concentration of the district’s population in this limited area.
Based on the 2009 population projections and the surface areas of usable land for human settlement and activity, the average district population density is over 450 people per square kilometre.

The map below shows the topographical distribution of LLGs across the district.
Kasese’s economic drivers

The following drivers propel economic activities in Kasese.

**Industry:** The two major industries in Kasese are Hima Cement Ltd and Kasese Cobalt Company Limited (KCCL). Hima Cement Ltd employs approximately 305 staff plus close to 500 contractors, and produces just over 800,000 tons of cement per year. KCCL employs roughly 250 people plus contractors and casual workers, and produces 685 tons of cobalt per annum, for export. Between them, these two industries also have significant indirect impacts on the economy of the district through the creation of other related employment activities, such as food vending, truck delivery services. A further manufacturer in the district is RECO Industries producing and processing a number of items including mattresses, tomatoes related products and fruit juice.
Tourism: Tourism is a significant economic driver in Kasese, and in Uganda as a whole. A number of national parks and other protected areas (e.g. Queen Elizabeth National Park, Rwenzori Mountains National Park and Kibale National Park) situated within the district borders are sanctuaries for bird and wildlife attracting tourists throughout the year. Tourism provides employment to a number of district residents, and has brought additional benefits such as road maintenance, additional markets for local products, improvement in housing infrastructure and the promotion of culture and traditional crafts. Moreover, through national revenue sharing, tourism has contributed to the construction of primary school blocks, health units and community halls in various areas of the district.

Hydro power production: Kasese district has 3 hydro power stations (Kilembe Mines Ltd, KCCL and Tronder Power). Between them they produce between 20–30.5 MW of power, serving the owners plants and the national grid.

Cotton and coffee production and processing: Cotton is the single major cash crop, for which the largest proportion of district land is tilled in every year. It is cultivated in almost the whole stretch of the mid lowlands of Kasese. 3 ginneries process the cotton into lint (Nyakatonzi Growers Cooperative Union, Rwenzori Cotton Ginnery and Western Uganda Cotton Co.). Arabica Coffee is the second most important cash crop, mainly cultivated in the mountain areas. Many business people in urban centres are engaged in its trade, and a few small processing plants exist throughout the district (including Bakwanya and Bukonzo Joint).

Urban and cross border commerce: Trade is the main engagement in the urban centres of Kasese, further bolstered by cross border commerce with the Democratic Republic of Congo especially in the border LLG of Mpondwe Lhubiriha.

Intensified agriculture: A relatively new economic driver, on a positive growth trend, is the cultivation of maize, passion fruit, mangoes and pineapples, the latter two crops on a commercial scale.

Tackling poverty in Kasese

The vision of Kasese District is to have a poverty free society by 2025. Currently, according to figures from 2002, 48% of the rural population of the district lived below the poverty line (UBOS, 2005). Though this indicates a decrease from 51% compared to ten years earlier, the district still faces many challenges and has health and education indicators below the national average (USAID, 2009).

To accomplish its vision of eradicating poverty, the district implements a comprehensive development plan, that seeks to achieve sustainable socio-economic development through efficient provision of quality services to the people in conformity with national and local priorities. It aims to achieve this by working in partnership with LLG and development partners.

For the 2011/2012 financial year, the district budgeted for UGX36.9bn. Of this, UGX33.5bn (90.8%) was realised by the end of the financial year. Locally raised revenue represented 1.2% of the total budget, with central government transfers corresponding to 93.3% and donor contributions amounting to 5.5%.
Table 1.1: District budget performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% actual vs budget</th>
<th>% performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Revenue</td>
<td>557,196,000</td>
<td>387,657,000</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>32,388,118,000</td>
<td>29,651,503,000</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>3,934,594,000</td>
<td>3,510,364,000</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,879,908,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,549,524,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KDLG, 2012

The table below shows the district's budgetary allocation over the last two financial years.

Table 1.2: Budgetary allocation per sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3,199,432,000</td>
<td>3,330,026,000</td>
<td>3,420,135,000</td>
<td>2,865,494,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,990,343,000</td>
<td>4,063,173,000</td>
<td>4,078,707,000</td>
<td>4,689,076,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14,990,343,000</td>
<td>13,253,488,000</td>
<td>17,904,528,000</td>
<td>16,169,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>2,941,294,000</td>
<td>2,703,474,000</td>
<td>2,880,571,000</td>
<td>3,136,692,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>959,822,000</td>
<td>565,477,000</td>
<td>1,202,727,000</td>
<td>552,403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>560,942,000</td>
<td>317,129,000</td>
<td>622,085,000</td>
<td>301,604,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor support</td>
<td>3,832,696,000</td>
<td>2,138,554,000</td>
<td>3,934,594,000</td>
<td>3,510,364,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KDLG, 2012

In many sectors budgets are underfunded with the actual spending falling short of what was budgeted for. The exceptions to this were health and roads in the year 2011/12. Education consumes the largest proportion of spending by a large margin and consistently has the highest proportion of its budget met.

The Belgian Technical Cooperation, through the Kasese District Poverty Reduction Programme, is the district’s strongest development partner. Focus has been on strengthening social infrastructure in remote areas (e.g. staff houses), on developing economic infrastructure (e.g. bridges, markets, electrification and irrigation), on enterprise development and support to vulnerable groups.

A number of other development partners and initiatives are currently being implemented throughout the district. A table representing some of the most prominent ones is found in Appendix 4.
Chapter 2: Who and where are the poor?

Key findings

- 47.1% of households fall into the ‘moderately poor’ wealth group, ‘extremely poor’ households represent 8.1% of households, while in the better-off wealth groups, 31.2% of households are ‘self-sufficient’ while 13.5% are ‘wealthy’.

- Just over ¼ of households are deprived in 3 or more basic needs, while a small but significant number of households (3.2%) are deprived in all five areas, indicating their extreme inability to afford basic household needs.

- Location, livelihood, education and the marital status of household heads all have an impact on the wealth and deprivation status of households in the district. Poor households (‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’) tend to live rurally, engage in petty livelihoods, and their household heads are likely to be less educated, and more frequently singles, divorcees or widows.

- Some of the main causes of poverty are land shortage, laziness or idleness, alcoholism and lack of employment or productive opportunities.

- Land issues are a serious concern to district residents. The majority of district households heavily rely on land resources for food and income, yet available land is limited and productivity is low. This results in increased food shortages, land conflicts between competing livelihood strategies and increased encroachment on protected areas and wetlands to the detriment of the environment.

- Despite high dependency rate and overpopulation being main causes of poverty in the district, the link between population growth and development is not clearly understood by community members. Fertility rates remain high, and population issues are not prioritised as means of combating poverty.

- Behavioural issues play a major part in causing poverty in the district. Laziness or idleness and alcoholism in particular rob households of vital income, and can lead to anti-social behaviours in the community.

- For the majority of households (64.4%) land conflicts have increased over the last 5 years, due to rapid population growth, poor legislation and leadership on land matters, inter-tribal conflicts, land shortage and fragmentation of household land.

- Food insecurity and illness are the main ways poverty affects households, along with need to engage in casual labour and to sell household assets.

- The majority of ‘extremely poor’ households are concentrated in Kitswamba, Muhokya, Kitholhu, Lake Katwe, Hima, Karusndara, Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Katwe Kabatoro, Nyamwamba and Bulembia divisions.
The LLGs with the highest concentration of severely deprived households are Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bugoye, Bwera, Kyarumba, Ihandiro, Maliba, Kyondo, Hima, Isango and Mpondwe Lhubiriha.

47.3% of households have perceived a decline in wealth over the past 5 years. More poor households and those with the most deprivations have experienced a decline in wealth, compared to those from better-off wealth groups and with fewer deprivations.

The LLGs with the highest concentrations of households experiencing a significant decrease in wealth over the past 5 years are Muhokya, Kyondo, Munkunyu, Kitswamba, Lake Katwe, Kyarumba, Nyakiyumbu, Kisinga, Nyamwamba division and Ihandiro.

The main reasons for declining wealth are high commodity prices/inflation, lack of capital, food shortage/drought and illness.

Bwesumbu, Kyarumba, Mahango, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira, Ihandiro, Kitholhu, Kyondo, Maliba and Karusandara have the highest hardship ranking score, meaning it is more difficult for households in these LLGs to access public infrastructure and services.

LLGs with higher hardship ranking scores do not also have higher concentrations of ‘extremely poor’ households, signifying that difficult access to public infrastructure and services does not necessarily have a significant impact on whether households are poor or not. Poverty is multifaceted and depends also on a number of other contributing factors.

With the exception of primary schools and health, which received more satisfactory ratings, most public services are rated poorly. The legal system (87.8%), power supply (76.8%), land administration and adjudication (75.0%) and credit (61.5%) are ranked the most unsatisfactory by households.

Context

This chapter identifies the poor, specifically the poorest households, and looks at their geographical distribution across the district.

**Box 2.1: Wealth index indicators**

In order to create a baseline for quantifying household poverty in the district, and to analyse a household’s wealth status against a variety of other factors including, but not limited to, access to public services and infrastructure, households were categorised into four different wealth groups: (1) ‘extremely poor’, (2) ‘moderately poor’, (3) ‘self-sufficient’ and (4) ‘wealthy’. A wealth index was generated to assign each household a wealth group. The wealth index is made up of a number of quantitative and subjective variables, based on a household’s access to and use of particular physical, productive and human assets (see Appendix 2 for details).
In addition, deprivation was also utilised as a measure of household poverty, loosely based on the deprivation index generated by UBOS. The district deprivation index is based on a household’s fulfilment of certain basic needs. These include ownership of clothes and shoes, availability of soap for bathing, weekly sugar intake, and ability to educate all of one’s children. Households are classified as deprived if they are unable to satisfy these basic needs. The degree of deprivation is measured by the number of unfulfilled needs (see Appendix 3).

The determination of the causes and effects of district poverty, considered in this chapter, was based largely on the perceptions of a variety of respondents.

It has long been thought that infrastructure and the provision of public services have a direct and positive impact on development. In this chapter, this hypothesis is tested and infrastructure provision and public services ranked and analysed against district household poverty.

Finally, the distinctive peculiarities of urban poverty as opposed to rural poverty are examined in this chapter. Though the bulk of the district’s population is rural, the population in urban LLGs is steadily increasing, with its own unique characteristics and challenges. This chapter will explore briefly the challenges that poorer urban households face similar in the district, where possible comparing them to those in rural areas.

**Characteristics of the poor**

Residents of Kasese understand poverty primarily as a lack of certain basic needs. A poor household is characterised primarily as one which is unable to adequately satisfy the basic needs of shelter, food, education, health and clothing, and one which lacks sufficient land. Poverty is expressed principally in physical terms rather than in monetary terms.

![Chart 2.1: Characteristics of a poor household](image-url)
Household wealth and deprivation status

According to the wealth index, 55.2% of households fall into the poor wealth groups (‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’), while the better-off wealth groups (‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’) represent 44.7% of households (see Appendix 2 for details of how households were classified into these groups).

The largest percentage of households is clustered in the ‘moderately poor’ wealth group (47.1%), followed by those in the ‘self-sufficient’ wealth group which represent 31.2% of households, those in the ‘wealthy’ group (13.5%) and finally households in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group representing 8.1% of households.

The sample size of the study represents 6.7% of the total number of district household, and given the average district household size of 5.3, the table below shows the number of households and people in each of the wealth groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Group</th>
<th>% in each category</th>
<th>No. of households</th>
<th>No. of people</th>
<th>No. of households</th>
<th>No. of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>11,260</td>
<td>59,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>23,161</td>
<td>65,474</td>
<td>347,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>15,322</td>
<td>43,371</td>
<td>229,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>6,657</td>
<td>18,766</td>
<td>99,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>49,131</td>
<td>138,872</td>
<td>736,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A direct comparison with other UBOS findings on poverty is not possible given the different study parameters. However, the most recent Participatory Poverty Assessment indicates that 78% of households sampled were perceived to be poor relative to others within the community, of these 22% were considered extremely poor, while the remaining 56% were poor but not extremely poor.
The results from this study show similar, though somewhat improved figures in terms of poverty. However, with over half of the district population living in poverty (extreme and moderate), reducing poverty still remains a critical issue.

The graph below shows the comparison of households’ own assessment of their wealth status with that assigned by the wealth index. It indicates that households generally have a more pessimistic view of their wealth status, that that assigned by the wealth index. For example, almost 30% of households perceived themselves to be in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group, while the wealth index shows a much reduced figure of 8.1%. Moreover, more households perceive themselves to be ‘moderately poor’ compared to the percentage allotted by the wealth index (50.5% versus 47.1% respectively).

Furthermore, fewer households consider themselves to be ‘self-sufficient’ or ‘wealthy’ compared to those assigned by the wealth index. According to the wealth index, 31.2% and 13.5% of households fall into the ‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’ wealth groups respectively, while only 19.0% and 11.1% of households perceive themselves to be in the ‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’ categories respectively.

The results are perhaps not surprising as the tendency to assess one’s status more pessimistically, when compared to others in the community, is not uncommon. Publicly, the wealthy often understate their wealth status, while the poor can tend to exaggerate the severity of their situation.

Results from the study reveal a common profile of those in the poor wealth groups (‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ households combined) and those in the better-off ones (‘self-sufficient’ households plus ‘wealthy’ ones). It is possible to note that, in comparison to better-off households, poorer households tend to live ruraly, are predominantly engaged in petty livelihoods (classified as other livelihoods in this study; see Context in Chapter 3), are less likely to be employed, and their household heads are considerably less educated, and tend to be made up of a higher percentage of singles, divorcees and widows.
Table 2.2: Common profile of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Better-off HHs</th>
<th>Poor HHs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living rurally</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in petty livelihoods</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head no schooling</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head tertiary education</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head single</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head divorced/separated</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head widowed</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above highlights some interesting issues for consideration. It indicates that raising the level of education of household heads has a positive impact on the wealth status of that household. It also shows that households with single, divorced/separated and widowed heads are more likely to be poor. Further, it points to the need to enhance income generating activities of the poor.

As per the table below, according to the deprivation index, only 2.7% of households experience no deprivations; that is, they are able to provide two sets of clothes and one set of shoes for all household members, they have soap available for bathing every day, they consume sugar seven days a week and they are educating all of their children. The vast majority of households face one (41.7%) or two deprivations (27.9%), while those with 3 or more deprivations together represent 27.8% of households. A small, but significant number of households (3.2%) are deprived in all five areas.

This means that while the majority of households in the district are deprived of only one or two basic needs, just well over a ¼ of households, face serious deprivations, and are unable to meet three or more basic needs.
The table below indicates the number of households and people experiencing household deprivations.

### Table 2.3: Distribution of household deprivations by households and population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivations</th>
<th>% in each category</th>
<th>PPM study</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of households</td>
<td>No. of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five deprivations</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four deprivations</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three deprivations</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>7,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two deprivations</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>13,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One deprivation</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>20,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero deprivations</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>49,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Causes and effects of poverty

Based on a semi-structured question, the most frequently mentioned causes of poverty, as perceived by residents of the district, are listed in the graph below.

#### Chart 2.5: Perceived causes of poverty

A predefined list of causes of poverty was also ranked, in terms of their importance as contributors to district poverty. Each potential cause was assigned one of the following ratings: ‘very important’, ‘important’, not very important’ or ‘not important at all’. The results are shown in the graph below.
The results indicate some similarities in both graphs, and are generally consistent with findings from other studies.

Lack of land is by far the most frequently mentioned and one of the highest ranked cause of poverty throughout the district. In view of Kasese’s limited usable land area and the increasing population, this is not surprising. However, given the important role of land in agriculture and rural development, effective management of land issues poses a serious challenge to the district.

Behavioural causes of poverty, such as laziness or idleness and alcoholism, are also among the most commonly stated causes and are ranked as some of the highest factors contributing to poverty in the district. Though laziness and idleness could be taken at face value to mean a disinterest in and unwillingness to engaging in productive employment, it could also be a consequence of inadequate productive or employment opportunities (also a frequently cited and highly ranked cause of poverty). This is particularly pertinent in view of Kasese’s young and growing population. A youthful and ever-increasing population, struggling to find productive economic activities to engage in, could have significant implications for the district’s future unemployment levels, security and crime rates and poverty statistics.

Box 2.3: Case study: Alcoholism

Bwambale Michael (name changed) is 36 years old and lives with his wife and 5 children. He has been excessively drinking alcohol for the past 15 years, and this has impacted the well-being of his family. Bwambale was given land by his father, half of which he sold in order to release cash income for the household. However, little, if any, of the money earned from the sale of the land has been invested in the homestead and family; rather it has been used to purchase alcohol. Bwambale spends most of his days in the company of local brewers, and contributes little to household income or activities.

The family lives in a very basic mud and thatched-roofed house built by relatives. Bwambale’s family do not own a decent set of clothes each, and food consumption is met by a small amount of food stuffs cultivated by the household, supplemented by donations from relatives. In order to earn a meagre income for survival, Bwambale’s wife and two of his children engage in petty trade. None of Bwambale’s children have ever attended school due to lack of school fees.
High dependency, overpopulation and lack of family planning are also cited and ranked as high contributors to poverty. Given the demographic momentum inherent in a young and growing population, these factors are likely to be of continued relevance to the district for many years and decades to come. If population trends continue as they are, the district will need to double its public services, every twenty years, just to maintain the current modest level of service delivery. Educating district residents as to the impact of large families on a range of development issues, including the district’s ability to provide services, should be seen as a priority by planners and policy makers. Coupled with this, an increase in education, information and access to family planning services needs to be made.

Climatic factors, such as unpredictable weather patterns and drought, were identified as further factors causing poverty. Kasese’s agriculture remains largely rain fed, with little use of technology and inputs to increase production and productivity. This means that livelihoods are highly susceptible to sudden shocks or changes in physical conditions.

Polygamy has mixed reviews. It is cited as a reasonably high cause of poverty in the district in the first graph, but is less significant in the second graph, where it is grouped with negative cultural traditions. The grouping of polygamy with negative cultural traditions, such as witchcraft and superstition, could account for this.

The relatively high scores indicating that high prevalence of HIV and AIDS is not very important or even irrelevant as a cause of poverty is interesting in light of sickness being one of the more frequently mentioned cause of poverty in Chart 2.5 above. One explanation for this could be that, given the increased access to HIV and AIDS related services and ARVs, people living with HIV and AIDS are healthier and living longer than before, and thus some perceive their condition not to be a contributing factor to poverty.

Also worth mentioning is the reasonably high number of people who think that over exploitation of natural resources is not important in causing poverty. This is particularly noteworthy in view of land shortage issues, overpopulation and the challenges already facing the district in terms of the degradation and depletion of natural resources. It highlights the need to better educate the district’s population on the need for good resource management, particularly in the face of increasing land and population pressures.

89.5% of respondents suggested that continued population growth would increase poverty in the district, 4.6 % suggested it would have no effect on poverty levels, while 5.9% said poverty would reduce as a result of population growth.
Furthermore, when asked whether a large population was positive because it increased a household’s income opportunities, almost 70% of respondents indicated that they disagreed with such a statement, as it increased expenditure, exerted pressure on available resources, and brought about increased conflict.

Though these results are encouraging for the district, and imply a degree of understanding of the complex relationship between population growth and poverty, evidence, from this and other studies, suggests that the population issue may not be a priority for district residents and that their understanding of the links might be somewhat tenuous (Renno, 2010).

In reality, with a high fertility rate of 7.4 (as compared to the national average of 6.7 which is one of the highest in the world) bearing children is highly valued in Kasese. Strongly ingrained cultural values advocate large families and gender inequalities and cultural practices, including polygamy, limit women’s ability to make fertility decision, inhibiting fertility decline. Moreover, low uptake of modern contraceptive methods, across the district, suggests either issues of accessibility, affordability or a lack of conviction of the need family planning (Renno, 2010).

Though some evidence suggests that fertility decline is being observed especially in urban areas, among educated couples, this is not the case for the majority of rural areas in Uganda, where the poor have the highest fertility rates (MFPED, 2011). High population growth, and the resultant high dependency, without being matched by a corresponding growth in the economy and investment in public services, will undoubtedly have negative implications for future household development and well-being.

The graph below indicates that 64.4% of respondents believed land conflicts to have increased in their community in the last 5 years. 15.3% stated there were no land conflicts in their areas, while for 13.1% of respondents land conflicts have remained the same and for 7.2% they have reduced.
By far the most reported reason for the increase in land conflicts was the growth in the size of the population, followed by poor legislation and leadership on land matters, inter-tribal conflicts, land shortage and fragmentation of household land.

The main reasons given for reduced land conflicts included proper marking of boundaries, good legislation and leadership on land matters, government allocation of land and the resolution of conflicts amicably.

With land conflicts on the rise, the pressure to encroach on or open up the district's protected areas (e.g. national parks, reserves and swamps) for use will undoubtedly increase.

A staggering 81% of respondents agreed, or strongly agreed, that national parks should be in part de-gazetted to allow for more farm and grazing land, while almost 41% of respondents thought that forests should be cleared for agricultural purposes. These views have significant environmental and economic implications for the district.

As the population increases the pressures on land will escalate exponentially, impacting food security, as well as contributing to increased conflict over land. Special attention should be paid to improving the production capacity of existing land and work to implement best farming practices. Moreover, it is recommended that strategies be planned for dealing with the anticipated increase in land conflicts equitably.

With regards to the effects of poverty on households within the district, the most frequently cited effects of poverty crisis are indicated in the graph below.
By far the most significant effect of poverty cited is the inability to satisfy a household’s food needs. In a predominantly agricultural society, as is Kasese, this is perhaps not surprising. Ill health is the next most mentioned effect of poverty. This could be interpreted in the sense that during a poverty crisis, households are unable to afford health care and thus suffer increased sickness. Alternatively, it could mean that a poverty crisis induces a greater level of illness, perhaps due to stress or because other basic needs, such as adequate feeding, are not being properly met.

Further effects of poverty crises are being forced to supplement a household’s income by engaging in casual work for others and selling off household assets in order to release moneys to meet the required needs. Disposing of household assets is particularly interesting, given that studies indicate that asset ownership plays a crucial role in a household’s ability to stave off poverty.

Looking at the top six effects of poverty crisis in relation to the wealth groups, findings suggest some effects of poverty crises affect poor households more acutely. In particular, more households in poor wealth groups tend to suffer from food shortages, illness and are forced to a greater degree to engage in casual work during a poverty crisis, primarily because of their lack of disposable income or ownership of assets which can be sold off during a crisis. On the other hand, compared to poorer households, better-off ones tend to be in a position to be able to sell off household assets during a poverty crisis, since they are more likely to have a greater number of assets to dispose of.
In order to mitigate the effects of poverty crises, particularly on poor households, it is necessary to bolster household income generating abilities, through boosting main livelihood productivity and enhancing secondary sources of income, such that households are better able to accumulate savings or assets to absorb the effects of the shocks or threats.

Wealth and deprivation index poverty hotspots

This section looks at the concentration and distribution of wealth and poverty across the district and within LLGs, in an attempt to highlight particular geographical poverty hotspots.

The map below shows the concentration of ‘extremely poor’ households across the district. The highest percentage of ‘extremely poor’ households is concentrated in Kitswamba, Muhokya, Kitholhu, Lake Katwe and Hima. For example, 9.9% of the district’s ‘extremely poor’ households are concentrated in Kitswamba. The LLGs with the smallest concentration of households in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group are Isango, Buhuhira, Rukoki, Kyabarungira and Ihandiro.
In terms of the distribution of wealth groups within each LLG, results suggest that wealth is not evenly distributed within LLGs, as shown in the table below. Perhaps not surprisingly, 5 of the 6 urban LLGs (all except Katwe Kabatoro) plus Kisinga, Bugoye, Maliba and Rukoki have significantly higher proportions of better-off household than poor household (‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’). On the other hand, LLGs such as Muhokya and some of the hard-to-reach LLGs (e.g. Mahango, Kyarumba, Kilembe, Kitholhu and Ihandiro) have much larger percentages of poor households compared to better-off ones.
As per the table above, 17 of the 28 LLGs (from Muhokya through to Lake Katwe), have higher percentages of poor households within the LLG than better-off ones. In three LLGs, 20% or more of households are ‘extremely poor’ (Hima 25.7%, Lake Katwe 23.1% and Muhokya 20.3%). However, though the highest proportion of Muhokya’s population are from poor households (91.2%), in terms of absolute numbers Kyarumba has more households in the poor wealth groups than other LLGs (6,292 households).

Whilst in percentage terms Muhokya has the highest proportion of poor households, in absolute terms Kyarumba has the highest number of poor households. The graph below shows the distribution of households by wealth group in absolute numbers. Kyarumba, Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Muhokya and Karambi have the highest number of ‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ households. Nyamwamba division, Kisinga, Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Maliba and Bugoye have the greater number of households in the ‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’ groups.
Chart 2.12: Absolute distribution of households by wealth groups within LLGs

Looking at household deprivations, the map below shows the concentration of severely deprived households (those with all five deprivations) across the district. It indicates that the most severely deprived households are concentrated in Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bugoye, Bwera and Kyarumba, while the LLGs with the smallest concentration of severely deprived households are Katwe Kabatoro, Kilembe, Lake Katwe, Bulembia division and Karambi.
The graph below indicates how household deprivations are distributed within LLGs. Results suggest that in all LLGs the highest proportion of households have between 1-2 deprivations. The distribution of other deprivations varies within the different LLGs.
For example, in Munkunyu, the largest percentage of households has 1-2 deprivations (59.4%), 31.7% of households have 3-4 deprivations, 7.3% are deprived in all 5 areas, while only 1.6% of households have no deprivations. On the other hand, in Bulembia division, the highest proportion of households also register 1-2 deprivations (68.2%), but it has a large percentage of households with zero deprivations (19.3%), and only 11.0% and 1.4% of households with 3-4 deprivations and all five deprivations respectively.

Whereas, in terms of the percentage distribution of wealth groups within LLGs, Bwera has the highest proportion of households with between 2-5 deprivations, in absolute numbers Maliba has more households in these deprivation groups than others (6,814 households).

In terms of absolute numbers, the graph below shows that Maliba, Nyamwamba division, Bugoye, Kyarumba and Munkunyu have the largest numbers of households with between 2-5 deprivations. Nyamwamba division, Kisinga and Mpondwe Lhubiriha have the largest number of households with only one or zero deprivations.
Changes in wealth status

Poverty is not static, and perceived changes in households’ poverty status have been experienced throughout the district. In the last 5 years, 47.3% of households claim to have faced a decline in wealth. Of these, more than half suggest that their wealth has decreased significantly, while the rest have experienced a moderate decline. 27.8% of households report no perceived change in wealth status, whereas almost a quarter of households (24.9%) indicate their wealth levels have increased, within which a small percentage (2.7%) registering a significant increase.
When examining changes in wealth status within wealth groups, interesting facts emerge, drawing light on which households might lack access to productive assets and economic opportunities. Within the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group, 56.6% of households have experienced a perceived decrease in wealth levels over the last 5 years; this decrease is considered a significant decline by 36.5% of households. Moreover, only 13.9% of households in this wealth group have recorded a perceived increase in wealth levels.

At the opposite end of the scale, within the ‘wealthy’ wealth group, a much larger percentage of households have recorded a perceived increase in wealth levels (36.0%) and a smaller percentage has experienced a perceived decrease in wealth level (35.9%), with only 17.5% reporting a significant decline.

[Chart 2.16: Wealth status changes within wealth groups]

Not surprisingly, it appears that the poor believe they have become poorer over the past 5 years, and the rich richer. Given the available data, it would be fair to say that poor households, particularly those in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group, are the ones who struggle the most to access capital and income generating opportunities that households in the ‘wealthy’ and ‘self-sufficient’ wealth groups enjoy. This, in turn, stops them from satisfying basic needs and from acquiring the productive assets necessary to increase their wealth status and either lift themselves out of poverty or stop themselves from sliding further into poverty. This highlights the need for the district to focus on increasing income generating opportunities, particularly of the poor, and improving their access to credit, so as to be able to acquire vital productive assets.

Moreover, climatic conditions and poor agricultural production account for those who have registered a decrease in wealth. These factors point to the dependence, particularly of the poor, on agriculture as the main source of household income and food security, and to the poor’s reliance on changing weather patterns, as well as their use of low technologies and poor agricultural inputs. This underlines the on-going need to invest in agriculture, the mainstay of the district’s rural economy.
Changes in wealth status within household deprivations shows similar findings to those mentioned above. The greater the household’s deprivations, the more wealth levels are perceived to have decreased. 61.2% of households experiencing deprivations in all five basic needs have perceived a decline in their wealth status. Of these, 37.8% perceive this decline to be significant, whereas 23.4% believe their decrease in wealth status to be more modest. Moreover, in this group, only 9.4% of households feel they have experienced an increase in wealth levels. The opposite is true for households experiencing just one or no household deprivations.

Changes in wealth status vary significantly within LLGs. In some LLGs, such as Lake Katwe, Kyondo, Muhokya Kitswamba and Kilembe, the highest proportion of households have experienced a decrease in their wealth levels, compared to those who have perceived no change or who believe they are economically better off now. In other LLGs, for example Maliba, the distribution of changes in wealth status is fairly evenly spread, with 33.4% of households facing a decline in wealth, 31.7% registering no change and 34.9% experiencing a rise in wealth levels.

Chart 2.17: Distribution of households experiencing wealth status changes within LLGs

The map below shows the district concentration of households experiencing a significant decline in their wealth status. It reveals that Muhokya has the highest percentage of households experiencing a significant decline in wealth over the past 5 years, followed by Kyondo, Munkunyu, Kitswamba and Lake Katwe. The LLGs with the smallest concentration of households experiencing a substantial decrease in wealth are Hima, Bulembia division and Isango.
The graph below shows which households within each LLG have experienced significant declines in wealth over the past 5 years. It reveals that in 15 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Mahango through to Kyondo in the graph below), 50% or more of those experiencing significant decreases in wealth are ‘extremely poor’ or ‘moderately poor’ households. In the remaining LLGs the greater proportion of those experiencing a decline in wealth are from the better-off wealth groups. This in part can be explained by the higher proportion of households in the better-off wealth groups in these LLGs. However, to fully understand why better-off households, as opposed to poor ones, in a number of district LLGs have reported experiencing significant declines in wealth further investigations should be made.
The main reasons given for a perceived decline in wealth status over the last 5 years are shown in the chart below.

Besides the above, other reasons cited for believing that wealth levels have reduced include: the loss of a spouse/partner through death or divorce/separation, low farm-gate prices, high cost of school fees, floods, wild animals eating crops, old age and lack of energy to work.

The chart below indicates the main reasons why an increase in wealth levels has been perceived.
In addition to the above, other reasons given for an increase in wealth status include: attained education and training, improved business and income opportunities, increased farm-gate prices, asset acquisition especially land and other productive assets, and participation in LC committees.

It is interesting to note that some of the same reasons given for the downward changes in wealth status also apply to the upward changes. This is particularly the case for productive assets and opportunities, indicating that while some households have been able to capitalise on their ownership of productive assets and make use of economic opportunities, the majority of households have not been so fortunate. For example, while some households that registered a decrease in wealth have attributed this decline to a lack of capital, other households for whom wealth levels have increased cite access to capital as the very reason for their improved wealth status. Thus, it would appear that certain households struggle to access the productive assets and opportunities required to increase their income and lift themselves out of poverty.

**Infrastructure and service delivery**

Infrastructure and services are vital to transforming household welfare. As well as assessing the quality of public services, this study utilised the ‘hardship ranking matrix’, developed by the KDPRP, to rank LLGs in terms of infrastructure and service delivery, and ascertain in which LLGs households might struggle more or less to access infrastructure and services.

**Box 2.4: Hardship matrix indicators**

The matrix included the distance of the LLGs headquarters to the nearest tarmac road, the category of the main road traversing the LLG, the average distance to the electricity grid, the type of LLG terrain, the type of health centre present within the LLG and the distance to UPE and USE schools.

The higher the percentage hardship ranking of the LLG, the greater the hardship experienced by households accessing...
The graph below indicates that households in some of the hard-to-reach LLGs have more difficulties accessing infrastructure and services compared to others, particularly in the urban LLGs and those located on the main tarmacked transport route through the district.

The matrix suggests that Bwesumbu has the highest hardship ranking, followed by Kyarumba, Mahango, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira, Ihandiro, Kitholhu and Kyondo. The LLGs with the lowest hardship scores are Mpondwe Lhubiriha, the municipality divisions of Central and Nyamwamba, Hima, Lake Katwe, Kitswamba and Muhokya.

When comparing the hardship ranking with the district concentration of ‘extremely poor’ households it is possible to note that at the extreme ends of the graph the two do not necessarily correlate. That is to say that the highest proportions of ‘extremely poor’ households are located within the LLGs with the lowest hardship ranking (with less difficult access to infrastructure and services) and vice versa, the LLGs with the highest hardship ranking house smaller percentages of ‘extremely poor’ households.

Thus, it is fair to say that whilst infrastructure and services are important factors for economic development, a household’s wealth or poverty status is also likely to depend on a number of other contributing factors. These may include, but not be limited to, available productive assets, household size, access to economic opportunities, access to credit and behavioural aspects.
In terms of the assessment of service delivery, most services were rated poorly or very poorly, with the exception of primary schools and health, which overall received satisfactory ratings. 87.8% of households ranked the legal system as unsatisfactory (poor and very poor), followed by power supply (76.8%), land administration and adjudication (75.0%) and credit (61.5%).

It is interesting to note, in view of the limitations and challenges of land in the district and the importance of access to affordable credit facilities in reducing poverty (as will be explored in subsequent chapters), that service delivery of land administration and credit are rated poorly by households. These should be prioritised and every effort made to improve and scale-up the delivery of these much needed services.
Moreover, despite the presence of three hydro-power plants in the district, the supply of power to the majority of district households still remains a challenge.

Urban versus rural poverty

The majority of poor households in the district are concentrated in rural areas; however, the growth of urban LLGs has potential implications for urban poverty. This section briefly explores the peculiarities of urban challenges in the district.

Though urban life can offer new income opportunities, it also has its own particular hardships. The cost of living for urban dwellers is generally higher than that of their rural counterparts, as housing is usually more costly, and food and fuel for cooking must be mostly purchased rather than grown. Moreover, sanitation conditions, as well as crime and security can be a significant threat to health and livelihoods. The table below summarises some of the main differences between urban and rural households, which impact on disposable income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Own: 93.8%</td>
<td>Rent: 6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food production</td>
<td>Grow: 76.8%</td>
<td>Buy: 21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood for cooking</td>
<td>Collect: 62.9%</td>
<td>Buy: 14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93.8% of rural households own their dwelling compared to 67.6% of urban dwellers. This means that more people in urban areas must rent housing, increases household expenditure, and diverting income away from other household consumption or from investment in productive assets. Moreover, urban residents indicate that rents in town are expensive, the number of houses is inadequate for the increasing urban population, houses are often poorly constructed and, due to poor drainage systems and urban planning enforcement, houses are often affected by floods.

Households in rural LLGs grow a higher proportion of their food compared to those in urban LLGs. For example, residents in Kilembe grow 89.9% of their food needs, while households in Bulembia division grow only 34.4% of their food requirements and must purchase the rest. This again increases the cost of living of urban residents, and particularly for poorer households, can have a significant impact on the amount and nutritional value of food consumed.

Added to the cost of living of urban dwellers is the purchase of fuel both for cooking and for lighting. Urban dwellers note that those in rural areas can freely collect firewood for cooking, whereas it is more difficult to obtain in urban centres, and 51.3% of urban households resort to buy firewood or charcoal.

A further significant challenge facing urban dwellers is crime and security. 90% of urban residents indicate that they are concerned about crime and security, as thieves threaten not only their lives, but also their assets and livelihoods. As the population grows, and with it unemployment, this issue will become of increasing concern to policy makers.

Finally, studies indicate that linkages between urban residents and their rural home communities offer valuable coping mechanisms in times of difficulties. However, 75% of urban dwellers suggest that they do not retain links with their communities of origin, and thus are not in a position to benefit from these during times of hardship. Those that do retain a link, reveal that they benefit by having food provided in times of food crises, through helping to cultivate land and protect crops, and by providing social and emotional support.
Chapter 3: Livelihoods

Key findings

- ‘Extremely poor’ households are predominantly involved in crop farming, trade and commerce, and other petty livelihoods. ‘Moderately poor’ households are also involved in crop farming, trade and commerce and services. Households with severe deprivations (all 5 deprivations) mainly engaged in crop farming, services and animal husbandry.

- Households involved in animal husbandry, small scale industrial production, other livelihoods, crop farming and fishing have less educated household heads. Those in employment have more highly educated household heads. Households engaged in animal husbandry, crop farming and trade and commerce have a greater number of dependents.

- 76.6% of subsistence farmers indicate that their economic situation has improved over the past 5 years. This is due to IGAs, land purchase, home improvements and employment. However, they face many challenges including an increasing number of pests and diseases, poor yields, unfavourable weather conditions, inadequate tools and price fluctuations.

- ‘Extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ crop farmers own on average only 0.02 acres and 1.2 acres of land respectively, and rent or borrow approximately 2.3 acres. This is insufficient to sustain household needs. Moreover, for 86.7% of subsistence cultivators yields have decreased over the last 20 years, due to soil exhaustion, pest and diseases and unpredictable weather patterns. Only 10% of subsistence crop farmers use of modern agricultural technologies.

- 43.3% of pastoralists suggest that their economic situation has improved over the past 5 years. IGAs, increased livestock and production and consistent earnings account for this improvement. 23.3% of pastoralists own less livestock now compared to 5 years ago. This is due to lack of pasture and water, drought and disease.

- For 50.0% of pastoralists, productivity per head has decreased over the last 5 years. Lack of pasture and water, a reduction in the number of livestock and disease are the main causes. 80% of pastoralists report vaccinating their cattle, though only 6.7% own exotic or cross breeds primarily because of the expense involved in purchasing and maintaining them. Lack of land and water are serious concerns for pastoralists. 71.2% state grazing land is not enough and 80% indicate that the availability of water for livestock is poor.

- 50.0% of capture fishermen state their economic situation has improved over the past 5 years, thanks to consistent earnings and few dependents. However, they face numerous challenges including the risk of predators, unfavourable weather, insecurity and disease, especially HIV and AIDS.

- For 70.0% of capture fishermen fish stocks have declined over the past 5 years. This is due to poor fishing practices, competition with predators, unfavourable weather, increased population and an influx of competition from the Democratic Republic of Congo. 40.0% suggested that regulations are useful though water resources are poorly governed and corruption hampers the implementation of regulations.

- Despite the importance of production infrastructure, such as markets and road, in improving livelihoods and boosting household incomes, productive infrastructure throughout the district
is weak and does not favour the poor and more deprived. The quality of roads (mainly community and feeder roads) is poor and hampers access to market for all livelihoods groups, though the poorest and most deprived households in particular struggle through poor roads.

- Households engaged in other livelihoods, crop farming and animal husbandry have the worst road access to markets. The highest concentration of households with very poor quality roads to market are Nyakiyumbu, Mahango, Bugoye, Munkunyu, Karusandara, Kyondo, Bwesumbu, Kitswamba, Kitholhu and Kyabarungira.

- On average, households own 1.86 acres of land. Households in Katwe Kabatoro, Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Bwera, Kyarumba, Isongo, Karambi, Hima, Bulembia division, Kitholhu and Central division own on average the smallest plots of land. However, the land owned by households in Mahango, Muhokya, Kilembe, Ihandiro, Isango, Kyarumba, Kitholhu, Bwera, Munkunyu and Nyakiyumbu has the lowest average value in Ugandan Shillings.

- ‘Extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ households only little land, only 0.02 and 1.2 acres respectively. Those involved in animal husbandry own the largest amount of land (4.02 acres), followed by crop farmers (1.96 acres) and those in employment (1.93 acres). The smallest amount of land is owned by households whose main livelihood is capture fishing (0.51 acres) and services (0.73 acres).

- Extension services, of both government and CSOs, fail to reach large percentages of the population, mainly poor households, and where they do the quality of service provide is often poor. Extension services (agriculture, livestock, fishery and forestry) are ranked poorly by the majority of households, with fisheries receiving the highest unsatisfactory rating (75.5%). The LLGs of Bulembia and Nyamwamba divisions, Katwe Kabatoro, Hima, Central division, Rukoki, Karusandara, Isongo, Bwesumbu and Ihandiro have the smallest concentration of households who received an extension visit during the past 12 months.

- Improving access to affordable financial services plays a key part in enabling household to acquire more productive assets and boost their economic activities, particularly for households involved in capture fishing, crop farming, animal husbandry, services and other livelihoods. Moreover, since poorer and more deprived households engaged in these livelihoods are among those who fail most often to obtain credit or keep up repayments, it becomes evident that credit services need to have a pro-poor focus. In percentage terms, more households in Bugoye, Kitswamba, Kitholhu, Kisinga, Kilembe, Isongo, Muhokya, Bwera, Nyakiyumbu and Munkunyu failed to obtain credit.

- Saving and credit groups are the main lending organisation for those in all livelihood groups, expect for households in employment who favour banks.

- Loans are secured primarily to set up or expand businesses, to pay for school fees, for household consumption, and for medical expenses. A greater proportion of households in the poor wealth groups and those with more deprivations, take out loans for household consumption, while most households in the better-off wealth groups and those with less deprivations acquire loans to invest in income generating opportunities or in the purchase of assets.

- Lack of land, unpredictable weather patterns, lack of capital and poor health are the main threats to livelihoods in the district.
Context

Kasese district is predominantly an agrarian society. Approximately 80% of the population is involved in crop production, animal rearing and lake fishing. Crop farming is primarily for consumption, with a few cash crops such as coffee and cotton. It is practices in the vast majority of LLGs across the district. Animal husbandry is the main livelihood source of the pastoralist communities who reside in various parishes of Karusandara, Lake Katwe, Muhokya and Munkunyu. However, as a secondary source of livelihood it is also practiced by households throughout the district. Lake fishing is limited to the communities around the lake shores in Katwe Kabatoro, Muhokya and Nyakiyumbu.

Other economic endeavours include trade and commerce, mainly involving retail trade located in the urban centres, and manufacturing and mining industries, such as Kasese Cobalt Company, Hima Cement, Kilembe Mines, RECO Industries and lime works and other small scale industries. Most of these larger ventures, together with the service industry and civil servants provide employment as a main source of income.

For the purpose of this study, 8 main livelihood categories are explored. These include crop farming, animal husbandry, capture fishing, trade and commerce, employment, services, small scale industrial production and other livelihoods. Small scale industrial production includes activities such as salt mining and mining of lime. Services relates predominantly to the provision of services including milling and the hospitality (e.g. hotels, restaurants, bars) and tourism industry, while other livelihoods, though not specified, include casual labour, brick making, artisan craft making, charcoal production, fish net making and any other petty livelihood not covered by the other categories.

In addition, through qualitative questionnaires, the study particularly focussed on the livelihoods of subsistence crop farmers, pastoralist and capture fishing communities. These were chosen as they represent the different sectors of the district’s agricultural activity, Kasese’s largest employer, and because each sector holds specific challenges which particularly impact for the poor. Subsistence agriculture was selected because of its ubiquitous nature within the district, representing a significant proportion of the population. The study chose to focus on capture fishing and pastoralist communities since both their livelihoods can be considered to be under threat, due to reduced fish stocks for capture fishing communities and due to lack of land for pastoralists. Moreover, especially for capture fishing communities which are restricted to protected areas, the possibilities for livelihood diversification are limited.

This chapter highlights the distribution of wealth and deprivations across livelihoods, and explores a number of issues which either hinder or facilitate households from boosting their livelihood production and increasing their incomes. In particular, household productive asset ownership is examined, alongside access to markets, provision of extension services and access to credit.

Finally, the threats, challenges of and effect of poverty on household in the different livelihood categories are explored, and the livelihood hotspots in the district identified.

Livelihood wealth and deprivation distribution

The main livelihoods of households involved in the study are crop farming (79.5%), trade and commerce (7.1%), employment (4.5%) and services (2.8%), followed by fishing (1.8%), other livelihoods (1.6%), animal husbandry (1.5%) and small scale industrial production (1.1%). The most practised secondary livelihoods are crop farming (18.9%), trade and commerce (16.7%), animal husbandry (13.2%), and services (9.3%).
The graph below shows the secondary livelihoods practiced by each livelihood. It indicates that the most practices alternative livelihoods vary and that a small percentage of households within each livelihood do not have an alternative livelihood (e.g. those who have indicated crop farming as a main livelihood also name it as a secondary one).

The data shows, for example, that for crop farmers and those involved in capture fishing the most popular secondary livelihoods are trade and commerce, services and other livelihoods. A significant proportion of crop farmers also practice animal husbandry as a secondary livelihood. Households involved in animal husbandry tend to prefer crop farming, trade and commerce, services and other livelihoods.

**Chart 3.1: Secondary livelihoods by main livelihood**

The graph below indicates the distribution of main livelihoods within the different wealth groups. It shows that within each of the wealth groups, the majority of households practice crop farming, though in varying percentages.

The majority of ‘extremely poor’ households practice crop farming (55.7%), followed by trade and commerce (18.5%) and other livelihoods (6.6%). Most ‘moderately poor’ households engage in crop farming (86.6%), trade and commerce (4.7%) and services (2.4%), with fewer households involved in animal husbandry (1.1%), other livelihoods (1.0%), small scale industrial production (0.8%).

Households in the ‘self-sufficient’ wealth group, predominantly engage in crop farming (83.3%), followed by trade and commerce (5.6%), and employment (3.6%). The majority of ‘wealthy’ households derive their main income from crop farming (60.5%), employment (15.3%) and trade and commerce (12.4%).
The graph below depicts the distribution of households’ main livelihoods by household deprivation.

Similarly to the distribution of livelihoods within wealth groups above, crop farming is the main livelihood practiced by households with the most deprivations. In addition to crop farming, the majority of non-deprived households engage in employment and trade and commerce, while severely deprived households (all five deprivations) predominantly practice crop farming, services and animal husbandry.

As shown in the table below, it is interesting to note that households involved in animal husbandry, small scale industrial production, crop farming, fishing and other livelihoods have less
educated household heads. Not surprisingly households involved in employment have the highest percentage of highly educated household heads. Those involved in animal husbandry, crop farming and trade and commerce have a greater number of dependents.

Table 3.1: Characteristics of households by main livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household main livelihood source</th>
<th>Crop farming</th>
<th>Animal husbandry</th>
<th>Fishing</th>
<th>Trade and commerce</th>
<th>Small scale production</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH head no schooling</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head tertiary education</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsistence crop farming

Crop farming is widespread across the district, with 79.5% of households indicating their involvement in it as a primary livelihood. Results from this survey further show that 57.0% of households involved in crop farming are from poor wealth groups, of which 5.7% are ‘extremely poor’ households. The latter are households which own limited or no land, have few or no productive or physical assets, have limited access to credit and only consume one meal per day.

30 subsistence crop farmers from across the district were surveyed for this study.

When considering their own wealth status compared to that of others in their parish, subsistence crop farmers tend to generally have a reasonably optimistic view of their wealth status. Although no respondents considered themselves to be ‘wealthy’, 57.1% of households deemed their wealth status to be ‘average’, a considerably higher percentage compared to their assessment of the wealth status of others in the parish of 32.1%. Moreover, fewer households considered themselves to be ‘extremely poor’ compared to their assessment of the parish average.

Chart 3.4: Comparison of parish wealth status and own wealth status
Most subsistence crop farmers interviewed indicate that their economic situation has improved over the last 5 years. However, for almost ¼ of subsistence cultivators (23.3%) their economic situation today has deteriorated compared to five years ago.

The reasons given for a worsening economic situation are the increase in pests and diseases and natural disasters such as landslides, both of which affect productivity and thus limit household income.

On the other hand, the set-up of an IGA, the purchase of land, the acquisition or improvement of one’s home and gained employment are among the most state reasons for the improved economic situation of subsistence farmers.
Despite positive improvements in the economic welfare of subsistence farmers, the graph below highlights the main challenges they face. Among the most significant challenges are the increase in pests and diseases, poor yields, unfavourable weather conditions and inadequate tools.

**Chart 3.7: Main challenges faced by subsistence crop farmers**

Lack of land is also an on-going challenge, and is of course the main productive asset of crop farmers. As will be further explored in the following section below on ‘Land’, crop farmers own on average 1.96 acres of land, with those in the ‘wealthy’ categories owning on average 4.2 acres and those in the ‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ categories owning on average only 0.02 acres and 1.2 acres of land respectively.

As per the graph below, interviews with subsistence crop farmers reveal that 33.3% have more land now that in the past 5 years, 40.7% have the same amount of land, while for over 1/4 of crop farmers their land holdings have reduced in size compared to five years ago. The reasons given for this decrease are inheritance being passed on to male children and the demand for income resulting in the sale of land.
66.7% of subsistence crop farmers suggest that they rent or borrow land for cultivation. On average the amount rented or borrowed is 2.3 acres.

Compared to 5 years ago, the graph below shows that most households rent or borrow the same amount of land, but that a small percentage of subsistence crop farmers (13.0%) rent or borrow less land now. This is due to the increased expense of renting land and high competition for land from others, which prevents subsistence farmers from being able to afford or being given the option of renting or borrowing additional land.

With increased demand on the limited usable land at the district’s disposal, it is fair to speculate that the cost of buying or renting land for cultivation will continue to increase, making it hard for poorer households to meet their income and food needs.
In fact, according to district officials (see box below), the amount of land owned and borrowed by subsistence farmers (on average between 0.02-1.2 acres owned plus 2.3 acres rented or borrowed) is not sufficient to sustain a household’s needs.

**Box 3.1: Sustainable land holding size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM SUSTAINABLE HOUSEHOLD LAND HOLDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The minimum number of acres necessary to sustain an average district household is <strong>4-5 acres</strong> for households employing <strong>traditional methods</strong> of farming or <strong>3 acres</strong> for household adopting <strong>improved methods</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most rural households grow a small amount of coffee, some matooke and cassava, and other seasonal crops like beans groundnuts and sweet potatoes. However, due to land shortages, households are forced to intercrop more than two crops in a garden, leading to low yields, food insecurity and low incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The small size of household land holdings in the district is mainly a result of the culture of land inheritance, whereby fathers subdivide their land to give to the sons when they marry and start their own homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is particularly true given the poor yields of most subsistence farmers. As per the graph below, 86.7% of subsistence crop farmers indicate that, on the same unit of land, yields have decreased compared to 20 years ago.

**Chart 3.10: Change in yields over the past 20 years**

The majority of crop farmers suggested that soil exhaustion due to overuse was the main reason for the decline in yields, followed by pests and diseases and unpredictable weather patterns. By contrast, improved farming methods and better extension services are cited by the 13.3% of crop farmers for whom yields have increased.

However, use of modern production technologies and agricultural inputs is still low, with only 10% of subsistence crop farmers indicating their use (improved varieties and pesticides). Reasons given for poor uptake of modern production technologies and inputs are predominantly their high cost, followed by ignorance about them, lack of accessibility and difficulty in applying the technologies.
63.3% state they participate in farmers’ groups, and indicate, as shown in the graph below, that they benefit from participation through the provision of small loans, the provision of advice and inputs, through use of farmer group facilities and the provision of seeds. The social interaction which comes from membership of a farmers’ group is also seen as a benefit alongside the ability to buy and sell in bulk.

---

As seen at the beginning of this section, both the better-off and the poor are involved in crop farming. As such, it is not the activity of farming itself that leads to poverty, but rather other contributing factors. To be able to sustain a household and provide an adequate income, crop farming must be of a certain scale and must extract the most of out the land in terms of productivity.

Subsistence crop farmers, with less than the district-suggested land holding of 4-5 acres, and with ever declining yields, will struggle to adequately sustain their families without a secondary source of income.
Since land in the district is finite, the principal ways of helping subsistence cultivators improve their wealth status are to increase productivity and to develop non-farm secondary sources of income. To achieve the first goal of improving productivity, targeted pro-poor focus of extension workers together with support for improving uptake of modern farming methods (e.g. credit to access inputs and farm equipment) are essential. Equally support for generating non-farm sources of income is needed, in the form of intellectual capacity building and training, as well as financial support to initiate IGAs.

**Pastoralism**

Pastoralist communities are predominantly located in the LLGs of Lake Katwe, Munkunyu, Muhokya, and Karusandara. Survey results show that 41.6% of households involved in animal husbandry are from the poor wealth groups, with 8.5% belonging to the ‘extremely’ poor wealth group.

30 pastoralist households considered to be worse-off than average were interviewed for this study.

The graph below shows that the pastoralists interviewed had a more pessimistic view of their wealth status compared to others in their parish. Significantly more households rated themselves to be ‘poor’ or ‘extremely poor’ compared to others in their locality, while fewer households deemed their wealth status to be average compared to others in the parish.

**Chart 3.13: Comparison of parish wealth status and own wealth status**

As per the graph below, 43.3% of interviewees have experienced an improvement in their economic situation over the last 5 years, 33.3% have suggested a decline in their economic situation over the same period, while it has remained unaltered for 23.3% of households.
The main reasons given for the worsening economic situation include a reduction in the number and productivity of livestock, increased household expenses, limited grazing land and the high cost of living.

By contrast, the improved economic condition of pastoralist households is due to diversification in setting up IGAs, an increase in the number and productivity of livestock, consistent earnings and the acquisition of land or homes.
Given the cultural and economic importance of livestock to pastoralist communities, the graph below indicates that 23.3% of pastoralists interviewed own more livestock now compared to 5 years ago, while the same percentage indicate owning less over the same period.

The reasons for the increase in livestock are due to the ability of some households to purchase more cattle and the increased availability of vaccinations and treatments.

However, for those who have registered a decline in the number of livestock, the main reason put forward is lack of pasture land and water, followed by drought, disease and increased household expenditure.
As with subsistence farmers, productivity has been affected. 50.0% of pastoralist households indicate that productivity per head has decreased over the last 5 years, as shown in the graph below.

**Chart 3.18: Productivity per head compared to 5 years ago**

Once again, lack of pasture land and water are the main contributors to reduced productivity. Other factors include a decrease in the number of livestock owned, disease, the use of traditional methods of livestock rearing and drought.

For those who have registered and increase in productivity, the ability to purchase additional livestock and the adoption of modern methods are reported as main contributing factors.

**Chart 3.19: Reasons for change in productivity**

80% of pastoralist households report using modern methods of livestock rearing. 100% of these households point to vaccination as the method used.
Only 6.7% of households reported owning exotic or cross breeds.

Those who have not adopted modern methods of livestock rearing, indicate that the reasons preventing them from doing so are ignorance about the methods and lack of extension workers to impart knowledge.

On the other hand, the reasons given for the poor uptake of exotic or cross breeds include their being too expensive to maintain and to purchase, too hard to look after, not suitable for the location and climate, and the preference for local breeds due to familiarity and resistance to disease.
As per the graph below, 71.2% of households suggest that the current available land for grazing is not sufficient. According to district officials, this is in part due to poor land management and conservation by pastoral communities, who do little to improve the availability and quality of grazing land, by clearing weeds (e.g. lantana camara) and rotating where cattle graze to allow for pasture rejuvenation.

**Chart 3.22: Availability of land for grazing**

![Pie chart showing 28.6% of land is enough and 71.2% is not enough.]

Of those that suggest that land is not enough, 68.4% indicate that they graze their animals in the protected areas.

When asked how available land for grazing compares to 5 years ago, 73.3% of households indicate that there is less land now. This is due to increased population, increased livestock and to the invasion by cultivators of land traditionally considered pastoral land.

**Chart 3.23: Availability of land for grazing compared to 5 years ago and contributing factors**

![Bar chart showing availability of grazing land compared to 5 years ago and factors contributing to the decline in available grazing land.]

- **Availability of grazing land compared to 5 years ago:**
  - Same: 20.0%
  - Less now: 70.0%
  - Don't know: 10.0%

- **Factors contributing to the decline in available grazing land:**
  - Increased population: 40.0%
  - Increased livestock: 30.0%
  - Invasion by cultivators: 20.0%
Moreover, 83.3% of pastoralists suggest that land conflicts have increased over the last 5 years primarily due to competition for land from other livelihood groups and to the increase in the size of the district population.

The availability of safe water for both human and livestock consumption is a significant challenge highlighted by pastoralist communities. 27.6% of households suggest that the availability of safe water for human consumption is adequate while 72.4% suggest it is poor. These percentages change to 20.0% and 80.0% respectively for the availability of safe water for livestock consumption.

Pastoralist communities face an increasing challenge as district populations of cattle and people increase. Limited land is already highlighted among the major factors contributing to poverty within pastoral communities, and a cause of increased conflict with other livelihood groups.

Resolving the shortage of grazing land will pose a significant dilemma for decision makers in the coming years. With nearly 70.0% of respondents indicating they are already involved in illegal grazing in protected areas, the pressure to de-gazette parts of the protected areas to allow for livestock grazing is undeniable. However, both at national and local level this would be counterproductive. Tourism is the country’s biggest foreign exchange earner and a significant driver of the district’s economy. Moreover, the benefits of de-gazetting protected areas would only be short-lived as livestock would quickly increase in number to fill the available land.

Effort needs to be directed at helping pastoralists take up modern methods of livestock rearing, most notably the adoption of exotic breeds. Through the adoption of exotic breeds of cattle, the pastoralists culture and way of life can be preserved, and the net value of herds maintained, but with fewer head of cattle, thus reducing pressure on land. However, this would involve expanding extension services and improving access to water.
Capture fishing

Capture fishing communities are located in the LLGs of Katwe Kabatoro, Lake Katwe and Muhokya. These communities are predominantly located inside the protected areas and therefore are limited in terms of land and the alternative livelihoods they are able to engage in.

According to the survey, 53.9% of households involved in capture fishing are from the poor wealth groups, with 13.3% of households being classed as ‘extremely poor’. In general terms, fishing communities can be divided into four main wealth brackets according to the type of fishing activity engaged in. These include, from the better-off to the poor wealth groups, boat owners, fish processors or vendors, barias and net makers.

30 households from across the district were interviewed as part of this study. These included barias, fish mongers and boat owners, as seen in the graph below.

The fishing households interviewed generally held a pessimistic view of their wealth status compared to others within their parish. No respondent ranked his household or others in the parish as ‘wealthy’, while fewer households considered themselves to be ‘poor’ (28.6%) compared with others in their locality (42.9%). On the other hand, 19.0% of households deemed themselves to be ‘extremely poor’, a category which was not assigned to others in the parish, while fewer households believed they belonged to the ‘average’ wealth category (52.4%) compared to others in the parish (57.1%).
On the whole, 55.0% of respondents suggest that their economic situation has improved over the last 5 years. 20.0% suggest it has remained the same, while for 25.0% of households their economic status has declined.

Reasons advanced for a decline in economic status include increased household expenditure, high dependency rates, high cost of living, theft, poor governance and lack of capital.

Those that have recorded an improvement in their economic situation point to consistent earnings, their involvement in fishing, a lack of dependents, the acquisition of a house and the start-up of an IGA, among others as contributing factors.
When asked what the main challenges of capture fishing communities are, the two most mentioned challenges were the danger posed by predators due to the location within protected areas of fishing villages and unfavourable weather conditions which make fishing in small boats precarious. In addition, respondents highlighted other challenges as insecurity, disease, especially HIV and AIDS and poor and corrupt enforcement of regulations.

When asked what the main challenges of capture fishing communities are, the two most mentioned challenges were the danger posed by predators due to the location within protected areas of fishing villages and unfavourable weather conditions which make fishing in small boats precarious. In addition, respondents highlighted other challenges as insecurity, disease, especially HIV and AIDS and poor and corrupt enforcement of regulations.
As per the chart below, 70.0% of respondents indicated that fish stocks have declined over the past 5 years.

**Chart 3.30: Fish stocks over the past 5 years**

The main reasons advanced for this decline are poor fishing practices, competition with predators, unfavourable weather, increased population and an influx of competition from the Democratic Republic of Congo.

**Chart 3.31: Reasons for decline in fish stocks**
Box 3.2: Case study: Declining fish stocks

Abine Deogracias is a 42 years old fishermen operating on the Kazinga Channel. Like his father, and his grandfather before him, he was born in Katunguru and started to fish when he was 20. Abine is a baria which means he does not own a boat, but works for a boat owner four days a week, taking 25% of the daily catch for himself. With 20 years fishing experience, Abine is in a good position to feel the effects of the depletion of fish resources:

“We have a serious problem nowadays for which nobody seems to have an immediate solution. Our population here at the landing site does not stop growing while the fish is every year more difficult to get. 20 years ago, me and my colleague used to bring about 70kg/week (equivalent to UGX 400,000) and we could both live decently and even put some shillings aside for the bad days. Nowadays, when we are lucky, we manage to bring 18kg/week (UGX 100,000), thus securing a maximum of UGX 25,000 each per week. I could buy a small house at that time but it is now in very poor conditions and I cannot repair it anymore. We are all struggling for a living and it gets worse and worse.”

Confined to the Queen Elizabeth National Park (QENP), there are few options for diversification. Abine has 7 children (from 1 to 11 years old) for which he wishes a better future:

“Thanks to God, food has not been a problem so far. Our major concern is the education of our children. I do not want them to take the same path as me as there is no promising future here. Unfortunately we can secure school fees for only 2 children. My wife has to regularly venture illegally into the QENP to collect firewood under the threat of wild animals and the park authorities. All of that to secure an extra meagre UGX 3,000 per trip”.

Respondents indicated that efforts were being taken to reduce the decline of fish stocks and these include community sensitisation and meetings organised by the beach management units, encouraging and monitoring the use of recommended nets, the involvement of NEMA and joint action against those using undersized nets.

Chart 3.32: Efforts to stop fish stock decline
When asked their opinion of the regulations governing the use of water resources, 60.0% of respondents indicated a positive response suggesting that they were useful in enforcing good fishing practices and for the sustainability of water resources. On the other hand 40.0% suggested that though useful, water resources were poorly governed and corruption has hampered the implementation of regulations.

Of the three selected livelihood groups (subsistence crop farming, pastoralism and capture fishing), capture fishing faces the biggest challenge. Lake fish stocks are finite and their replacement time is fixed. As such, any increase in volume of fish caught is at the expense of fish stocks. It is unanimously agreed that overexploitation has led to reduced fish stocks, which in turn has led to reduced income and increased poverty for some.

To stem the current pattern, every effort must be made to preserve the current fish stocks, encourage the availability of future fish resources and to enforce every protective measure to ensure that fish stocks do not totally collapse in future years. Increased and improved enforcement and oversight of the enforcement structures must be seen as a priority. A conscious decision must be taken by decision makers to preserve the livelihoods of some at the detriment of others, by restricting absolute numbers of those engaged in fishing.

However, earning opportunities from fisheries are limited and with little or no opportunities for livelihood diversification in fishing villages themselves, priority should be given to investigating alternative livelihoods compatible with the location of capture fishing communities within national park enclaves. This is particularly crucial for young people who may have limited economic opportunities within fishing communities in years to come.

**Access to local markets**

Markets are an important productive infrastructure, and accessing them plays a key role in sustaining people's livelihoods. Results from this study indicate that 64.5% of household have access to local markets locally within their community from which to sell goods produced by the household, whereas 35.5% do not. Furthermore, findings suggest that there is little difference between the different wealth groups and household deprivations in terms of access to market. This being the case, it is fair to suggest that access to local markets is not a major factor influencing poverty.

As per the graph below, within the main livelihood categories, the proportion of households with access to local markets varies. For example, 79.3% of capture fishing households has access to local markets compared to 20.7% who do not. On the other hand, within small scale industrial production only 38.4% have access to local markets as opposed to the majority of 61.6% who do not.
The pattern varies also in terms of the distribution of HHs with access to local markets within LLGs, as shown in the graph below. Higher proportions of households in Kisinga, Buhuhira, Lake Katwe, Kyabarungira and Kyondo access local markets compared to those that do not, while Kilembe, Kitholhu, Rukoki, Central and Nyamwamba divisions have much smaller percentages of households accessing local markets as opposed to those that do not access them. This is unexpected for LLGs in the vicinity of Kasese municipality, as the opportunities of accessing local markets are much greater.

Access to local markets is gained predominantly via community roads (56.1%). 36.4% of households use feeder roads to access markets, while 4.3% use trunk roads and only 3.2% use the district’s highways.
The quality of these roads is deemed to be inadequate by more than half of the households (54.3%). Of these, 33.0% of households rate the roads as poor while the remaining 21.3% consider them to be very poor. The roads are believed to be in fair condition by 31.3% of households, and only good by 14.3%.

Overall, the poorest quality roads are predominantly community and feeder roads, which are used by the largest proportion of households in the poor wealth groups and those within the category of most deprivations.

The highest proportion of households in all main livelihood groups use community roads, followed by feeder roads. Capture fishing, trade and commerce and employment have relatively higher proportion of households accessing markets via trunk roads. Fishing in particular has a relatively high percentage of households using highways, indicating products are traded over larger distances.

However, the quality of roads varies considerably within livelihood categories, as seen in the graph below. For example, those involved in capture fishing have both a high percentage of good roads (43.9%) and of very poor roads (33.5%). Small scale industrial production has a high proportion of fair roads (68.7%) and a small percentage of very poor roads (8.1%).

Other livelihoods, crop farming and animal husbandry have higher percentages of households indicating that the quality of roads is poor or very poor, indicating that gaining access to markets could be more of a challenge for these livelihoods.
Also within all LLs, the larger proportion of households uses community or feeder roads. The only exceptions are Lake Katwe where the largest proportion of households uses community roads and highways and Bulembia division where most households use trunk roads and feeder roads to access local markets.

However, the quality of roads within LLGs varies. 17 out of the 28 LLGs have higher proportions of households indicating that the quality of roads to local markets is poor or very poor.

The map below shows the district concentration of households with very poor quality roads to local markets. It indicates that, across the district, the LLGs with the highest concentration of households with the worst roads accessing local markets are Nyakiyumbu, Mahango, Bugoye, Munkunyu, Karusandara, Kyondo and Bwesumbu. It is not surprising that a number of these LLGs are classified as harder-to-reach.
Easy access to markets enables individuals to achieve maximum potential income. The quality and provision of roads determine the ease of access to markets. This survey has shown that a majority consider the road network to be inadequate and ill-maintained. In regard to the poor, who face the greatest challenge in transporting their goods to market, efforts should be concentrated on maintaining and upgrading roads which would give them easier access to markets. This survey indicates that Nyakiyumbu, Mahango, Bugoye, Mukunyu, Karusandara, Kyondo and Bwesumbu are the LLGs in most pressing need of road investment.
Land

As seen previously in Chapter 2, ownership of productive assets plays an important part in wealth generation. Perhaps the most significant productive asset in the district is land. In terms of ownership of land, findings indicate that the average household land holding is of 1.86 acres.

The map below shows the average household ownership of land in acres. It reveals that households in Lake Katwe have on average the largest plots of land, followed by Kyabarungira, Bwesumbu, Rukoki and Buhuhira. The LLGs with the smallest average size of household land holdings are the urban LLGs of Katwe Kabatoro and Mpondwe Lhubiriha.

Map 3.2: Average ownership of land (acres/HH)
In terms of the value of land the picture is somewhat different. Households in 5 out of the 6 urban LLGs (all except Katwe Kabatoro) own on average land that is much higher in value than those in other LLGs. On the other hand, the value of land owned by households in Mahango, Muhokya, Kilembe, Ihandiro, Isango, Kyarumba and Kitholhu is much reduced.

Chart 3.38: Average value of land owned (UGX)

As per the graph below, ‘extremely poor’ households own virtually no land of which to speak of (0.02 acres), while ‘moderately poor’ households own on average 1.16 acres of land. Not surprisingly, ‘wealthy’ households own the most land, on average 3.72 acres. When examining household deprivation, on average those with fewer deprivations own large portions of land compared to those with more deprivations, though the difference is slight.

Chart 3.39: Average ownership of land (acres/HH) by wealth group and household deprivation

The table below indicates that households involved in animal husbandry own on average the largest land holdings (4.02 acres), followed by crop farmers (1.96 acres) and those in employment (1.93 acres). Households whose main livelihood is capture fishing or services own on average the smallest land holdings (0.51 acres and 0.73 acres respectively). In terms of capture fishing, this can
be explained by the restrictions of land ownership given the location of the landing sites in protected areas.

However, as previously seen land is not evenly distributed among the wealth groups. The table below show the average distribution of land and its value within the main livelihood categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Livelihood</th>
<th>Acres owned</th>
<th>Land value (UGX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop Farming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6,218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>19,866,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>195,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal husbandry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5,930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>24,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>159,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1,266,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>14,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>30,318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade &amp; commerce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>293,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5,432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>210,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small scale industrial production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3,786,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20,919,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>486,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>28,355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>165,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16,766,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17,429,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>224,903,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately poor</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4,434,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>34,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134,375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the distribution of land ownership by wealth group within LLGs, the graph below shows that in all LLGs land is predominantly owned by the better-off households, especially ‘wealthy’ ones. ‘Extremely poor’ households on average own small plots of land (between 0.1 and 0.3 acres) in Bwesumbu, Mahango, Karusandara, Ihandiro, Bwera and Bugoye, with even smaller plots owned in Kilembe, Kitholhu and Central division (between 0.01 and 0.02 acres). In all but one LLG (Bulembia division) land is not owned by the ‘moderately poor’ or ‘extremely poor’ households surveyed.
Land scarcity is already, and will increasingly become, a critical issue within the district. No matter how efficiently land is farmed, if it is inadequate in size, it will not be able to provide for the household’s needs. The ‘moderately poor’ and the ‘extremely poor’ own insufficient land to satisfactorily provide for their needs. This lack hinders them, especially the poorest households, from escaping poverty. This situation is only going to get worse, as the population grows and family land is further subdivided amongst children.

The issue of land is inextricably linked to population growth, as the larger the population the greater the pressure on land resources. Whilst population growth remains a politically divisive topic, the practical demographics of a rapidly growing population will quickly increase pressure on land. Without significant efforts from policy makers, to address land and population issues, it is likely that the poor with limited land will slide further into poverty, and those that are already ‘extremely poor’ will face a desperate existence. Given the young and growing population, the scaling up family planning services across the district, with particular emphasis on the youth, is paramount to tackling issues of rapid population growth. Moreover, in view of the limited available land and the increased land conflicts, is essential that land administration and adjudication services be significantly strengthened, and that, if not already in place, viable strategies for land use management be developed. This is particularly true since land administration services rate very poorly, as seen in Chapter 2.

**Extension services**

It is important to note that responses of households concerning extension visits are not necessarily based on the household’s primary livelihood as households from each livelihood category indicated they received extension visits. Naturally, households involved in certain livelihoods, such as employment or services, would not typically receive extension services. However, the nature of a household’s secondary livelihoods could warrant an extension visit, and explain why households in each livelihood category have responded positively to questions relating to extension services.

Findings suggest that regardless of wealth or household deprivations, households are equally served in terms of extension services. However, results indicate that on average just under 50.0% of households in all wealth groups have not received an extension visit during the past 12 months, indicating that a large proportion of the population is not being served.
Within main livelihood groups extension visits varies. Households in some livelihoods are better served than others. For example, 58.8% of households involved in capture fishing received a visit compared to 41.2% of households who did not. Within crop farming, more than ½ of households were visited by an extension worker (52.3%), while the remaining 47.7% were not.

**Chart 3.42: Percentage of households receiving extension visits within main livelihoods**

[Bar chart showing percentage of households receiving extension visits across different livelihoods]

In terms of the proportion of visits within LLGs, certain LLGs fare better than others. In 15 out of the 28 LLGs, the majority of households received an extension visit within the last 12 months. In the remaining 13 LLGs, the proportion of those who did not receive a visit in the past year is greater than those that did.

It is not surprising that in urban LLGs, such as Nyamwamba division, Mpondwe Lhubiriha and Central division the proportion of households not receiving extension visits is higher than those that do, as urban dwellers predominantly rely on non-agricultural based activities and, therefore, do not require extension visits. However, it is worth noting that in a number of LLGs, especially some of the more hard-to-reach ones, more than half of the LLG households are not being reached by extension services (e.g. Bwesumbu, Rukoki, Mahango, Bwera, Kisinga and Kitholhu).
However, when examining the distribution of extension visits by wealth group within LLGs, the graph below shows that in 17 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Muhokya to Lake Katwe in the graph below), the majority of households receiving visits were from the poor wealth groups, while in the remaining 11 LLGs the most of those receiving visits were from the better-off groups. This in part can be explained by the larger proportion of better-off households in these LGs, but may also reflect a preference to work with better-off households rather than targeting those in the ‘extremely poor’ or ‘moderately poor’ wealth groups.

However, given the small land holdings of poor households and the declines in productivity, as seen in previous sections of this report, the importance of targeting these households from extension visits cannot be underestimated.
The map below indicates the percentage district concentration of households visited by an extension worker in the last 12 months. It shows that the LLGs with the highest concentration of households having received an extension visit within the last year are Munkunyu, Maliba, Muhokya, Bugoye, Nyakiyumba and Kyarumba.

By contrast, across the district, fewer households were visited in the past 12 months in the urban LLGs of Bulembia division, Nyamwamba division, Katwe Kabatoro, Hima, Central division as well as in Rukoki, Karusandara and Isango.

As seen in the chart below, the majority of the extension visits are carried out by government agencies (59.9%), followed by NGO/CBOs (30.5%).
However, as per the graph below, the majority of households reached by government are those in the ‘self-sufficient’ wealth group, with only a small percentage of households in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group being reached. NGO/CBOs also predominantly target ‘self-sufficient’ households, though they reach a higher percentage of ‘extremely poor’ households and fewer ‘wealthy ones. SACCOs primarily serve the ‘moderately poor’ though fail to reach the those in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth groups. VSLAs seem best placed to reach poor households, especially those in most need.

In terms of main livelihoods, the graph below shows the distribution of extension visits by organisation. In all livelihood categories, the majority of households were visited by government extension workers during the past 12 months. The exception being those involved in animal husbandry, the majority of whom received an extension visit from an NGO or CBO.
The majority of households ranked extension services (agriculture, livestock, fishery and forestry) as very poor or poor. Fisheries extension services received the highest unsatisfactory ranking (75.5%), followed by forestry extension services (70.7%). However, households ranked forestry services as having the highest positive ranking (good and very good) (8.8%) followed by fishery and livestock services (both 8.5%).

Fisheries workers indicate that the poor ranking fisheries extension services could be attributed in part to (1) absenteeism of extension staff on-site, (2) poor communication efforts by the district fisheries office to publicise its efforts, (3) low budget compared to other extension services and (4) repression activities (e.g. lake patrols and road blocks) which are badly perceived though they contribute to the long-term improved of the state of fisheries.
Extension services, which enhance livelihood production, are essential in improving productivity and boosting household income. However, this report identifies that the extension services of both government and civil society organisations are not targeting the poor in the community, with less than 10.0% of visits reaching the poorest households.

The poorest households have the least disposable income and have the most difficulty accessing credit (see section below). This makes adopting new practices very hard, even when they are desirous of doing so. It is undoubtedly easier to achieve results from extension services when targeting those in the better-off wealth groups. However, if poor households are to be given any chance of improving their livelihoods, extension serves will need to be intensified and targeted at both the ‘moderately poor’ and the ‘extremely poor’.

That said, a pro-poor policy for extension services in itself is not enough. A holistic approach needs to be undertaken where whereby extension services work hand-in-hand with micro-loan schemes, and where stronger cooperation between government and CSOs leads to the provision of both training and physical resources necessary to undertake improved productivity.

**Access to credit**

Limited access to credit was highlighted in Chapter 2 as a cause of poverty in the district. Yet, the ability to access credit, not only to meet household expenses, but especially to acquire productive assets is crucial to combating poverty, by improving household income.

Not surprisingly, the poor wealth groups were less successful at obtaining a loan than the better-off wealth groups. 53.9% of ‘extremely poor’ households and 54.9% of ‘moderately poor’ ones were unsuccessful in gaining a loan, compared to 37.4% of ‘self-sufficient’ households and only 28.0% of ‘wealthy’ ones, who failed to secure loans. A similar pattern applies to households with a greater number of deprivations.

![Chart 3.49: Percentage of households by loan status by wealth group and household deprivation](chart)

This could be explained by the fact that ‘extremely poor’ households and those with more deprivations, have fewer assets (as seen in the previous section) to use as collateral to secure a loan.
Results from this study indicate that most households requiring a loan in the last six months came from the livelihood group of fishing (29.7%), followed by those in employment (27.8%), trade and commerce (26.0%) and crop farming (23.0%).

However, not every household that required a loan obtained one. In general, high proportions of those requiring a loan failed to secure one in all livelihood categories, as seen in the graph below. More households involved in crop farming, capture fishing, services, animal husbandry and other livelihoods failed to obtain loans, compared to those that did secure them.

**Chart 3.50: HH loan status by main livelihood**

Where loans were successfully secured, it was predominantly the ‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’ households in the following livelihoods who obtained them: trade and commerce, capture fishing, animal husbandry and employment. On the other hand, of those who obtained a loan from other livelihoods, crop farming, services and small scale industrial production, 50% or more of households belonged to the poor wealth groups.
The map below indicates the percentage district concentration of households who failed to obtain credit.

It shows that the highest concentration of households who did not succeed in obtaining a loan are found in Bugoye, Kitswamba, Kitholhu, Kisinga, Kilembe, Isango and Muhokya. The LLGs with the smallest percentage density of households not obtaining required credit are Katwe Kabatoro, Karusandara and Buhuhira.
As shown in the graph below, apart from households in employment, the larger share of lending organisations, within each main livelihood, are saving and credit groups. A reasonably large proportion of households engaged in animal husbandry borrow from a relative or a friend, while a large proportion of those in employment receive loans from banks. A relatively small, but significant percentage, within each livelihood group, borrows money from money lenders.
Joining the local Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) was a life changing experience for Vangirini Rau, a 42 years old woman from Rwentutu, Lake Katwe.

“Being exposed to a culture of saving was a new experience for me, but now I have learned to save and it is helping me”. Through the VSLA micro loan access, Vangirini has been able to greatly boost her income by the trebling of the land which she now farms annually. “Before I joined the VSLA I used to farm one acre of cotton, maize and beans. Now I am able to cultivate 3 acres. This has enabled me to buy some productive assets like a goat and pigs and to send my children to private schools where previously they were going to government schools”.

Participation in the VSLA has done more than simply provide a financial boost to the household. It has also empowered Vangirini to become more self-reliant, owning and controlling her own productive assets, and has enabled her to actualise her potential as a leader in her community. “As a woman I am proud to own a goat and other assets. I am proud to be contributing to the family. I recommend VSLA to all, especially to women. My daughter has also joined and is very active”.

Loans are accessed for a variety of reasons, as indicate in the tables below.
Chart 3.5: Loan usage

The greater proportion of loans, within all livelihood groups, is taken out to set up or expand business or to pay for school fees. For those in employment, purchasing land is one of the main reasons for accessing a loan.

On the whole, a greater proportion of households in the poor wealth groups and those with more deprivations, take out loans for household consumption, while the greater proportion of households in the better-off wealth groups and those with less deprivations acquire loans to invest in income generating opportunities or in the purchase of assets. For poorer and more deprived households this means that the immediate consumption needs takes precedence over longer term investment needs, making it harder for these households to improve their income and asset base, and lift themselves out of poverty.

Credit schemes which target the poorest are far from straightforward. With little collateral loans are risky, and with limited incomes accumulating savings is hard. Moreover, the struggles of day-to-day survival mean that, in all likelihood, loans will be consumed for immediate needs rather than being invested in productive assets. This is reflected in the findings of this report indicating the ‘markets’ aversion to giving loans to the poorest.

However, despite its difficulties, the role of microloans in helping the households improve their livelihoods is well documented. As such, ensuring that the poor have adequate access to credit is vital. In particular, given that the poor have limited options in terms of the sources of credit available to them, it is important to advocate for and support savings and credit schemes, such as VSLAs, which are more accessible to the poor and, as respondents in this report suggest, are more successful at meeting the needs of the poor.

Livelihood threats and effects of poverty

Overall, the most cited threat to households’ livelihoods is limited capital, followed by illness, unpredictable weather leading to food shortage and lack of land.
In general, these threats are felt by different wealth groups and household deprivations similarly. The only exceptions are limited capital which is felt more significantly by those in the ‘wealthy’ households and lack of education which is felt more severely by those in the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group.

Focussing on the 6 most mentioned threats above, the graph below indicates which threats are felt the most by households within each livelihood category. It shows, for example, that for crop farmers unpredictable weather leading to food shortages and illness are the most significant threats. Those involved in trade and commerce rank lack of capital and illness as their most pressing threats, while those engaged in animal husbandry cite unpredictable weather and lack of land as their most significant threats.
Besides the above, interviews with subsistence crop farmers, pastoralists and capture fishing communities highlighted some additional threats more specific to each livelihood.

For subsistence crop farmers, the increase of pests and diseases, failure to achieve desired yields, the inadequacy of tools, price fluctuations and high cost of inputs were mentioned as additional challenges facing them. Pastoralists cited the increase in pests and diseases, the lack of clean and safe drinking water for both humans and livestock, poor and insufficient grazing land and low prices for livestock products as their main threats, while those involved in capture fishing highlighted the risk of encountering predators, HIV and AIDS, the lack of clean and safe drinking water and inadequate educational facilities as their main livelihood threats.

The graph below shows how livelihood threats are felt within LLGs.
The effects of a poverty crisis impact households from the different livelihood categories differently. The table below indicates the top three effect of poverty on the different livelihood groups.

### Table 3.3: Effect of poverty crisis by main livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main livelihood</th>
<th>Casual work for other people</th>
<th>Lack of food</th>
<th>Selling off HH assets</th>
<th>Illness</th>
<th>Drop out of school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop farming</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal husbandry</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture fishing</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and commerce</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale industrial production</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, in times of crisis households involved in crop farming engage in casual work for others, suffer food shortages and sell of household assets to overcome the crisis.

Threats and shocks to livelihoods are an unfortunate inevitability, and for the most part unpredictable and uncontrollable events. Since there is often no way to prevent the occurrence of such events, efforts should be made to help households mitigate their effects.
Chapter 4: Food availability and nutrition

Key findings

- For 67.4% of household production is largely for home consumption. ‘Moderately poor’, ‘self-sufficient’ and deprived households produce the majority of their household food needs, while ‘wealthy’ and ‘extremely poor’ households purchase the bulk of their food requirements. Households in rural LLGs grown most of what they consume, whereas those in urban LLGs purchase the bulk of their food needs.

- Consumption of meals per day is on a sliding scale with ‘wealthy’ and non-deprived households consuming on average 2.6 and 2.7 meals respectively and ‘extremely poor’ and severely deprived household consuming only 2.0 meals per day on average. Households in Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Lake Katwe, Karusandara, Katwe Kabatoro, Mahango, Isango, Bwera, Hima and Ihandiro have on average fewer meals per day.

- Most households throughout the district are food insecure. 54.6% of households experience food shortages during one or more seasons, and of these 8.3% are food insecure during all four seasons. Fewer households from poor wealth groups never or rarely experience food shortages, while most suffer difficulties satisfying their food needs at least once during the four seasons.

- Most households experiencing food shortages during all four seasons are concentrated in Kisinga, Kitswamba, Kyarumba, Lake Katwe, Ihandiro, Munkunyu, Central division, Muhokya, Bwer'a and Mahango.

- The size of land available to households has a direct impact of food security. The larger the size of land available to households for cultivation, the lower the prevalence of food shortages.

- The main causes of household food shortages are crop failure, sickness or lack of energy to produce, pests and diseases and an increased number of dependents. Small land holdings also contribute to food shortages.

- The main coping mechanism to mitigate the effect of food shortages are engaging in causal labour (34.1%), purchasing food items (31.8%) and reducing the number of meals consumed per day (9.4%).

- 84% of households do not have sufficient food reserves for the next 2-3 months.

- Cassava, matooke, and Irish potatoes are the most consumed food items. Consumption of nutritionally high foods is low. Meat or fish is consumed on average 1.9 times per week.
Context

The performance of the agricultural sector can have both a direct and indirect impact on the human health and welfare (UNDP, 2007). Poor crop, livestock and fish productivity can negatively affect consumption and nutrition levels, jeopardising the health and effectiveness of the productive workforce.

With this in mind, this chapter looks at the availability and sources of household food, and seeks to determine whether the district’s population is food secure or whether households in certain wealth groups, geographical locations or livelihood categories are vulnerable to food and nutrition insecurity.

This study explores the consumption habits of district households, the challenges faced in satisfying household food needs, and the adequacy of household food reserves.

Quantitative data from the study is predominantly used, supplemented by qualitative information. The survey was conducted during the start of the main rainy season when food shortages are common.

Food availability and sources

The main crops produced by households are cassava and sweet potatoes (63.3% of households), matooke (44.6%) and cereals (e.g. maize, millet) (42.7%). Goats and poultry are the main livestock reared (29.9% and 26.2% respectively), though within pastoral communities, the main livestock is local cattle.

Chart 4.1: Household production and sales

The graph above shows that most of the crops produced and livestock raised are consumed by the household. Of the crops produced, just over a ¼ of cereals are sold, 15.1% of sweet potatoes and cassava are sold, and 13.1% each of fruits and vegetables are sold, while only 9.9% of matooke is
sold. The percentages of items sold are higher in respect to livestock, with almost 50% of pigs reared being sold, 31.4% of goats, 27.8% of cattle and 37.9% of milk being sent to the market.

The vast majority (67.5%) of households produce what the household consumes, 30.4% of households purchase their food requirements from markets, while a small percentage of households receive what they need from relatives or neighbours.

Chart 4.2: Source of household food

As shown in the graph below, ‘moderately poor’ and ‘self-sufficient’ households predominantly produce what they require in terms of food needs, whereas ‘wealthy’ and most especially ‘extremely poor’ households mainly purchase their food requirements. Given that ‘extremely poor’ households own little or no land (as was seen in the previous chapter) this is not surprising. However, it does highlight the highly insecure position ‘extremely poor’ households find themselves in with regards to meeting their food needs. They do not own sufficient land to provide adequately for their households’ food needs, and their limited income restricts the amount of food they are able to purchase, placing them at greater risk of malnutrition and under-nutrition. In turn, this potentially exposes them to the negative economic and social effects of ill-health.

The picture is somewhat different when examining how food is sourced across household deprivations. Deprived households tend to have a higher proportion producing their own food, while those who have no deprivations have a greater percentage of households who meet their food requirements by purchasing it from the market.
When observing the results within the LLGs, as per the graph below, unsurprisingly the urban LLGs have greater proportions of households who purchase most of what they consume from markets, while LLGs in rural areas have larger percentages of households mostly producing what they consume in their own gardens. District officials suggest that rural households in particular have a poor culture of purchasing food, preferring to direct what small disposable income they have towards non-food items such as school fees, medical care and clothing.

LLGs located within the QENP, such as Katwe Kabatoro, also have high proportions of household purchasing food items as crop farming is not permitted in protected areas.
Food security and nutrition

When it comes to the number of meals consumed per day, on average, poorer households have fewer meals per day than better-off ones. Figures indicate a sliding scale from the ‘extremely poor’ households, who consume on average 2.0 meals per day, to the ‘wealthy’ households, who on average have 2.6 meals per day.

The same pattern applies to household deprivation. The non-deprived household consumes more meals per day (average 2.7), while the severely deprived household (all five deprivations) takes just 2 meals per day.

However, according to a previous study, during months of food scarcity (July, August and September), the majority of households (51.0%) consume on average just one meal per day, 31% of households take two meals per day and only 17% consume three meals per day (KDLG, 2009b).

The map below shows the average number of meals taken per day over the last 7 days.

It reveals that households in some of the more rural, mountainous LLGs, such as Bwesumbu, Kyabarungira and Buhuhira, consume on average more meals per day, compared to those in the lowlands or in urban LLGs. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that plot sizes in more remote LLGs are bigger and thus food is more readily available, whereas in urban LLGs food, more often than not, must be purchased. In addition in the lowlands, herdsmen stay with the cattle and cotton labourers work the entire day only being able to access food in the morning and late afternoon.
As seen in the graph below, a relatively high percentage of households (42.9%) state that, during the past year, they never or rarely experienced food shortages. A small, but nonetheless worrying, percentage of households (8.3%) suggest their food requirements were not met during all four seasons of the previous year.
These figures show that while a good proportion of households are completely food secure, well over 50% of households are not food secure all year round. This has significant implications for productivity and for human health.

In general terms, results indicate that a larger percentage of poor households suffer difficulties satisfying their food needs at least once during the four seasons, and fewer households never or rarely experience food shortages. By contrast most ‘wealthy’ households never or rarely experience food shortages while only a smaller percentage experience food shortages at some time. The pattern is repeated for households within household deprivations, whereby those with the most deprivations suffer more food shortages and fewer incidences of never or rarely have difficulty satisfying their food requirements than those with less or no deprivations.

As indicated in the graph below, food shortages are experienced differently within the various LLGs. For example, in Isango the majority of households experience food shortages between one to all four seasons, while only a small percentage of households never or rarely experience them. 40.4% of households experience shortages during two seasons, 28.4% during 1 season, 4.4% during 3 seasons and 10.7% of households experience food shortages during all four seasons. The remaining 16.0% never or rarely experience difficulties satisfying their food needs.

On the other hand, in the LLG of Maliba, the majority of households never or rarely experience food shortages (71.5%), followed by 10.8% of those who face them during 1 season, 9.8% who encounter them during 2 seasons, and 2.8% and 5.1% of those who respectively face them during 3 and all four seasons.
Households in highland LLGs with abundant rain (e.g. Maliba, Mahango and Kitholhu) usually have fewer food shortages. Lowland LLGs (such as Lake Katwe, Kitswamba, Muhokya and Munkunyu), situated in the rift valley, have more droughts and crop failures. An exception is Karusandara which has underground streams to mitigate the effects of droughts. Kitswamba is particularly vulnerable because of maize mono-cropping and regular delayed rains.

The map below indicates the percentage district concentration of households experiencing difficulties satisfying their food needs during all four seasons. It shows that Kisinga, Kitswamba, Kyarumba and Lake Katwe have the highest concentration of households experiencing food shortages during all four seasons, while Karusandara, Karambi and Kitholhu have the smallest percentage of such households.
Though Karusandara has only a small percentage of the district’s households experiencing food shortages during all four seasons (0.5%), the graph below shows that, of those households experiencing such difficulties, 100% of them are from the ‘extremely poor’ or ‘moderately poor’ wealth groups. In fact, in 17 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Karusandara to Maliba in the graph below) 50% or more of households experiencing food shortages during all four seasons are from the poor wealth groups.

By contrast, and somewhat surprisingly, in 5 out of the 6 urban LLGs (all except Central division) and in the LLGs of Kisinga, Bugoye, Karambi, Lake Katwe, Rukoki and Kitswamba greater proportions of better-off households experience difficulties satisfying their food needs. This in part can be accounted for by the fact that there are larger percentages of better-off households in these LLGs. However, for a fuller understanding of why large proportions of better-off households
in many of the district’s LLGs experience food shortages during all four seasons further investigation should be conducted.

Chart 4.7: Household experiencing food shortages during all seasons by poor households within LLGs

![Chart 4.7: Household experiencing food shortages during all seasons by poor households within LLGs](image)

Results further show that food shortages decrease as land size increases and vice versa. The graph below indicates that those with larger plots of land (average of 2 acres) never or rarely experience food shortages while those with small plots (average of 1.6 acres) encounter difficulties satisfying their food needs all year round.

Chart 4.8: Land owned in acres versus food shortages

![Chart 4.8: Land owned in acres versus food shortages](image)

Crop failure is by far the most stated reason given for household food shortages. Others include sickness/lack of energy to produce, pests and diseases, more dependents, food stolen and lack of storage facilities. District officials also point to small land holdings as a cause of food scarcity.
Given that agriculture remains largely dependent on rainfall, it is not surprising that crop failure is the highest cause of household food shortages. Solutions to reduce crop failure (e.g. mixed farming, drought resistant crops, water conservation with contour lines and mulching, irrigation) could have a positive impact on production and food availability in the district.

The most frequently adopted actions to mitigate the impact of food shortages are engaging in casual labour to boost household income (18.8%) and purchasing required food items (17.6%). Other coping mechanism include reducing the number of meals taken per day, receiving help from relatives or neighbours and either sending children away to relatives or sending them to eat with neighbours.

To ensure food security, it is accepted good practice to ensure that a household has adequate food reserves for the next 2-3 months. However, a total of 84% of households indicate that they do not have adequate food reserves for the next 2-3 months. Of these, 20% suggest that their food...
reserves are not at all adequate, while the remaining 64% of households indicate their reserves are not very adequate. Only 16% of households have sufficient food reserves for the next 2-3 months.

Chart 4.11: Adequacy of household food reserves

The reasons for inadequate food reserves are many and diverse. Chief amongst them is low production on already depleted land. In fact, 86.7% of cultivators suggested that crop yields have decreased over the last 20 years. Reasons for this include soil exhaustion due to poor farming practices, crop diseases and unpredictable weather patterns. Similar, though less pronounced, declines in productivity and stocks are also reported by livestock rearing and fishing communities.

Moreover, low use of modern technologies and inputs could account for poor productivity. Results suggest that 90% of crop farming households do not use modern agricultural technologies. The main reasons advanced for non-use include the expense involved in using these technologies, lack of access to and ignorance about them. 93.9% of households involved in animal husbandry also indicate that they do not own exotic or cross breeds. Reasons given for this include the expense of both purchasing and maintaining these breeds, the complex nature of looking after such livestock, and their lack of adaptability to the local context and climate.

According to district officials, other reasons for insufficient food reserves include high demand for money for school fees and medical care, leading household heads to selling off even food crops. Moreover, insufficient and ineffective storage facilities and a ‘live-for-today’ paradigm, which does not place high value on future planning and preparedness may also be responsible for insufficient food reserves.

This picture of food insecure within the district is cause for serious concern to human welfare. Ensuring that district residents are able to meet their current and future food needs should be a priority for the district.

Food security, however, does not depend solely on the quantity of food consumed, but also on its nutritional value. In order to get a better picture of the type of foods consumed by households, respondents were asked what the household consumed the previous day. The graph below shows that the most frequently consumed food items are cassava (48.3%) and matooke (43.9%). District officials also indicate that consumption of Irish potatoes is high. Consumption of nutritionally high foods is very low.
This indicates that households throughout the district do not have a balanced diet, consuming predominantly carbohydrates and very few fruits and vegetables, and proteins.

When examined by wealth group, results indicate that households in the ‘extremely poor’ category consume more cassava and more vegetables than other wealth groups, but less of all the other food items. In particular, ‘extremely poor’ households consume significantly less porridge, fruits, milk and meat or fish compared to ‘wealth’ households.

On average meat or fish is consumed 1.9 days per week. However, consumption per wealth groups is on a sliding scale with ‘extremely poor’ households consuming meat or fish least often (1.4 days per week) and ‘wealthy’ households eating it most frequently (3.1 days per week).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household wealth group</th>
<th>Fish or meat consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that the diet of ‘extremely poor’ households is far less varied, and nutritionally poorer, than most other wealth groups, especially those in the better-off categories. Poor nutrition leads to poor health, and policy makers need to address these nutritional imbalances to positively impact human development, the mainstay of the economy.

In addition to financial considerations, district officials also suggest that women’s heavy workload impacts negatively on both the number and the quality of meals consumed. Due to their household and productive commitments, women do not have enough time to prepare what they would want to, leading to fewer and less nutritionally balanced meals.

A healthy and productive workforce is the backbone of the district’s economy. However, for many households the quantity and nutritional value of meals consumed, especially during times of food scarcity, is inadequate to sustain a healthy lifestyle. This is particularly true for poor households.
The issues surrounding improving food security echo much of what has been identified in previous chapters. To ensure food security amongst the most vulnerable, it is necessary not only to improve production and productivity, but also to increase household incomes through non-farm opportunities. This requires, as previously mentioned, greater investment in extension services and in the provision of affordable financial services and training opportunities.
Chapter 5: Education

Key findings

- Current education infrastructure is not sufficient to meet the need of the district population. Not only are there not enough government schools within 5 kms of many households, but there are insufficient teacher, classroom materials, latrine stances and staff houses to ensure that the young district population receives quality education.

- Government schools rate poorly in terms of quality compared to private schools. Poor households are slightly more critical of the quality of schools than those in better-off households. A high percentage of households in Bwesumbu, Kyarumba, Buhuhira, Kitholhu and Katwe Kabatoro rate the UPE and USE schools in their LLG as poor or very poor quality.

- The average distance to the nearest UPE school in the whole district is 1.53Km and that for USE schools is 3.87Km. Households in Lake Katwe, Buhuhira, Kyarumba, Kitswamba, Munkunyu, Bwesumbu, Bwera, Nyakiyumbu, Karusandara, Ihandiro and Kyondo have longer average distance to travel to UPE schools. For USE schools, the LLGs with the longer average distance to travel are Buhuhira, Rukoki, Bwesumbu, Lake Katwe, Bugoye, Kyarumba, Nyakiyumbu, Kitholhu, Maliba and Kilembe.

- The majority of district households send their children to UPE and USE schools (70%). The 30% of household whose children attend school in private facilities indicate that the main reasons for this are the improved quality of education, the proximity of the private school to the household and children receiving sponsorship to attend private schools.

- On average, children attend school 4.8 days per week. Bugoye, Lake Katwe, Kitswamba, Munkunyu, Bwera, Bwesumbu, Isango, Muhokya, Ihandiro and Buhuhira have the highest concentration of households reporting child absenteeism. The main reasons given for child absenteeism are unpaid school fees, sickness, lack of scholastic materials, seasonal work, household or farming chores and lack of interest.

- Only 8.6% of households indicate that girls miss more school than boys. Most households regardless of their wealth group do not prevent their girls from attending school. However, households with more deprivations have higher percentages of girls missing more school than boys compared to household with no deprivations. Bwesumbu, Kyarumba, Lake Katwe, Kyabarungira, Kitswamba, Kyondo, Buhuhira, Maliba Muhokya and Munkunyu have the highest concentration of households where girls miss more school than boys.

- A household’s size and the educational status of the household head have an impact on whether girls miss more school than boys. The large the household and the less educated the household head, the greater the number of girls missing school compared to boys.

- 29.5% of households indicate that at least one child in the household has dropped out of school in the last 6 years. 98.6% of households with severe deprivations have had at least one child dropout of school. Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Kyondo, Kyarumba, Kyabarungira, Buhuhira, Bwesumbu, Muhokya, Kitswamba and Hima have the highest concentration of households with children dropping out of school. The main reasons given for school dropouts were high school fees, pregnancy, marriage and orphan-hood.
• 28.5% of households report that one or more members of the household have never attended school. Households with more deprivations indicate higher proportions of households with members who never attended school compared to those with fewer deprivations. The LLGs with the highest concentrations of households with members who have never attended school are Munkunyu, Nyakiyumbu, Bwesumbu, Buhuhira, Bugoye, Kyabarungira, Kitswamba, Rukoki, Mahango and Muhokya. The main reasons given for never attending school include lack of school fees, lack of interest in education, parental decision, orphan-hood and disability.

**Context**

According to a recent report, the district has education indicators well below the national average (USAID, 2009). In fact, teacher to pupil ratios, classroom to pupil ratios, desk to pupil ratios, latrine stances to pupil ratios and staff houses to staff ratios are all much higher than the expected national standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Education indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to pupil ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom to pupil ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk to pupil ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine stance to pupil ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff houses to staff ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the District Development Plan suggests that the education sector faces serious challenges in terms of rampant absenteeism of pupils and teachers, inadequate school support, supervision and inspection, and inadequate staffing particularly in schools in hard-to-reach LLGs (KDLG, 2011). School dropout rates are also reported to be high, due to a variety of reasons including defilement, child labour, early marriages and lack of midday meals. The latter, in particular, is brought about by the failure of parents and guardians to provide for basic requirements, due to low incomes and food insecurity in homes across the district.

Yet education plays a significant part in development. An educated population is one more likely to comprise of a skilled and productive workforce, able to positively contribute towards the growth of the district economy, and towards the socioeconomic well-being of households and communities.

As shown in Chapter 2 and seen in the table below, there is a correlation between poverty and educational level of household heads. The higher the educational level of the household head the more likely the household is to be better-off. The opposite is also true; poor households tend to have less educated household heads. Given this correlation, the importance of education in development is apparent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2: Correlation between poverty and educational level of household head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH head no schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better-off HHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter explores issues of school attendance and dropouts, in both government and private facilities, looking briefly at the quality of educational facilities and the reasons behind various education related behaviour.
Cost, quality and distance of educational facilities

For households with children in government schools, the average cost per term for a child in a UPE school is UGX 10,158 and for a child in a USE school is UGX 83,445. Results indicated very little difference between the costs encountered by urban and rural households.

Households rated the quality of private schools much higher than that of government schools. For 80.4% of households, the quality of education in private schools was considered good or very good. This contrasts with government schools, where less than half of households rated USE good or very good (48.7%) and only 36.5% of households ranked UPE in this quality category.

![Chart 5.1: Quality of government and private schools](chart)

When examining the quality ratings of schools by wealth groups, the graph below shows that poor households are slightly more critical of the quality of schools than those in better-off households. This may be explained by the limited opportunities poor households have to choose the schools their children attend. The majority of households in all wealthy groups rate private schools better than government ones and USE schools generally better than UPE schools, with the exception of ‘extremely poor’ households who rate the quality of education in UPE schools better than in USE.
A similar pattern is observed when analysing the quality of schools by household deprivation. Households with more deprivations have higher proportions of poor and very poor quality schools, whereas those with no deprivations do not rate the quality of private education to be inadequate.

The graph below shows perceptions of the performance of schools within LLGs. It specifically looks at the ratings of poor or very poor quality of education. It indicates that a high percentage of households in Bwesumbu, Kyarumba, Buhuhira, Kitholhu and Katwe Kabatoro rate the UPE and USE schools in their LLG as poor or very poor quality.

Surprisingly, relatively high proportions of households consider UPE education to be poor or very poor especially in relation to USE and private school education, particularly in the LLGs of
Karambi, Nyamwamba and Central divisions, Rukoki and Maliba. Further investigation could be made into the reasons behind this, which may include high levels of teacher absenteeism, larger class sizes or an increased awareness and expectations of parents.

**Chart 5.4: Poor and very poor quality ratings of government and private schools by LLG**

On average, the distance to the nearest UPE schools is 1.53 kms and to USE schools is 3.87 kms.

The map below shows the distance, in kms, to the nearest UPE school. The LLG with the longest distances for households to access a UPE school are Lake Katwe (2.59 kms), followed by Buhuhira (2.14 kms), Kyarumba (2.07 kms) and Kitswamba (2.03 kms). On the other hand, households residing in Nyamwamba division (0.84 kms), Central division (0.99 kms), Mpondwe Lhubiriha TC (1.04 kms), Muhokya (1.05 kms) and Isango (1.06km) have the shortest distances to travel to the nearest UPE school.
The map below indicates the distance, in kms, to the nearest USE school. The LLG with the longest distance to travel to access the nearest USE school is Buhuhira (8.12 kms), followed by Rukoki (7.83 kms), Bwesumbu (7.76 kms) and Lake Katwe (7.52 kms). The shortest distance households travel to USE schools are in Hima TC (1.25 kms), Katwe Kabatoro TC (1.66 kms), Karambi (1.73 kms) and Bulembia division (1.76 kms).
Attendance of educational facilities

The majority of household children attend government UPE and USE schools, with only 30% of households indicating that children attend school in private facilities.

The main reasons given for attending private schools are the improved quality of education, proximity of the private school to the household and children receiving sponsorship to attend private schools. This indicates the importance that parents and guardians place on the quality of education provided.

In general terms, results indicate that fewer households from poor wealth groups attend private schools compared to households in the better-off groups. The same goes for households
deprivations. Deprived households mostly send their children to government schools, while the majority of non-deprived households send their children to private educational facilities.

Within all LLGs the majority of households send their children to government schools (graph below). However, the proportions vary within each LLG. For example, in Hima 52.8% of households send their children to government school while 47.2% of households send their children to private schools. At the opposite end of the scale, in Mahango, 86.3% of households send their children to government educational facilities, while only 13.7% send their children to private ones.

Chart 5.5: Private school attendance within LLGs

As seen in the graph below, in terms of the district concentration of households who send their children to private schools, the LLGs with the highest proportion of households whose children attend private schools are Kitswamba, Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Kyabarungira, Kisinga and Bugoye. Those with the fewest households with children attending private schools are Kilembe, Katwe Kabatoro and Bulembia division.
On average, children attend school 4.8 days per week. This is the same pattern across wealth groups and household deprivations.

The distribution of child absenteeism is fairly even across each term. Households suggest that 25.5% of children sometimes miss school during the 1st term (Feb-May), 20.0% during the 2nd term (May-Aug) and 25.9% during the 3rd term (Aug-Dec). A further 28.7% were unsure in which terms children occasionally missed school.

According to the district school inspection report for the 4th quarter of 2011/12, attendance levels across the district, both in private and government schools was at 70%, up from 60% the previous year (KDLG, 2012b). Attendance is usually poor at the beginning of each term (first two weeks) and towards the end of every term (last 2-3 weeks), ranging from 15%-30%. This practice is usually associated with (a) parents diverting children to work in their gardens during the peak seasons, (b) parents' failure to prepare children for the new term and (c) parents not registering their children. As such, according to district officials, parents carry the main burden of responsibility for poor attendance.

As per the graph below, only in two LLGs do the majority of households report occasions when their children miss school (Lake Katwe and Isango with 60.8% and 55.6% of households respectively). In all other LLGs, the majority of households indicate their children always attend school, though this percentage of households reporting such varies. For example, 95.3% of household in Kilembe state that their children never miss school while in Bwera, 54.7% of households assert the same.
Chart 5.7: Child absenteeism within LLG

As seen in the map below, Bugoye has the highest concentration of households across the district reporting occasional non-attendance of children at school. Other LLGs with high concentrations of household in this category are Lake Katwe, Kitswamba and Munkunyu. The high concentration of households in these LLGs might be explained by a number of factors including a scarcity of schools and seasonal work which requires additional labour.

The LLGs with the lowest district concentration of households in which children are absent from school are Kilembe, Bulembia division, Rukoki and Central division. This might be accounted for by the fact that households in these LLGs are in the catchment area of the municipality and, therefore, have the higher teacher to pupil ratios and potentially better supervision.
The main reasons given for occasional non-attendance are shown in the graph below. They include unpaid school fees, sickness, lack of scholastic materials, seasonal work, household or farming chores and lack of interest in education.
As per the district records, the absenteeism rate of children in school, especially primary school, stood at 30% across the district (KDLG, 2012b). As at the beginning of the 3rd term of 2012 (first two weeks), 80% of children missed school, particularly affected were government primary schools. This was mostly due to the preparatory season for crop planting, whereby children either help in their parents’ gardens or earn cash by working for others.

Only 8.6% of households indicate that girls miss more school than boys.

Only in a small percentage of households within all wealth groups and household deprivations do girls miss more school than boys. However, results show that households with more deprivations have higher percentages of girls missing more school than boys compared to household with no deprivations.

In terms of school attendance of the girl-child within LLGs, the graph below shows that the majority of households within all LLGs report that girls do not miss more school than boys, though the percentage of households in which girls do miss more school than boys varies. For example, in Bwesumbu 19.1% of households indicate that girls are absent from school more than boys, compared to Katwe Kabatoro where only 0.7% of households report the same.
Chart 5.9: Girls missing more school than boys within LLGs

The chart below show the district concentration of households in which girls miss more school than boys.

Bwesumbu, followed by Kyarumba, Lake Katwe, Kyabarungira and Kitswamba have the highest concentration of households with girl-child absenteeism. By contrast, the LLGs with the lowest concentration of households in which girls miss more school than boys are Katwe Kabatoro, Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Mahango and Hima.

Chart 5.10: Percentage district concentration of HHs in which girls miss more school than boys

The table below indicates the characteristic of a household in which girls miss more school than boys. It shows that the level of education of the household head and the size of the household have a bearing on whether girls miss more education than boys. The higher the level of education and the smaller the household size the less likely girls are to miss more education than boys.
Table 5.3: Characteristics of household in which girls miss more school than boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HHs in which girls miss more school than boys</th>
<th>HHs in which girls DO NOT miss more school than boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH head no schooling</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH head tertiary education</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4% of households, in which the household head has no formal education, report that girls miss more school than boys, compared to just 5.2% of households, in which household heads are educated to tertiary level. Moreover, in larger households more girls tend to missing school compared to boys, whereas in smaller households few girls are occasionally absent from school.

**School dropouts and no schooling**

According to district officials, school dropout rate across the district was 11% as at the end of the financial year 2011/12.

Results from this study show that 29.5% of households indicate that at least one child in the household has dropped out of school in the last 6 years.

There is little variation when analysing school dropouts with wealth group. The proportion of children dropping out of school within each of the wealth groups is similar ranging from a high of 30.8% for ‘wealthy’ households to a low of 27.4% for ‘extremely poor’ households. The contrast is more striking when it comes to household deprivation. Households with severe deprivations have a very high proportion of children dropping out of school (98.6%), while only 0.8% of children in non-deprived households drop out of school. This indicates the precariousness of households with severe deprivations, and the devastating effect deprivation can have on education.

The dropout rate is considerably higher in rural LLGs compared to urban ones, with 88.2% of households who report that a child has dropped out of school within the past 6 years residing in rural LLGs, compared to only 11.8% of households from urban LLG.

As seen in the map below, the highest concentration of households across the district with children dropping out of school is Munkunyu. This LLG is followed by Nyakiyumbu, Kyondo and Kyarumba. The LLGs with the lowest concentration of households with dropouts are Bulembia division, Katwe Kabatoro, Mahango and Central division.
In terms of the distribution of school dropouts within LLGs, the graph below shows that the majority of households in all LLGs indicate that no child has dropped out of education in the last 6 years. However, these percentages vary. For example, in Hima 51.1% of households report no school dropouts, while in Bulembia division, this percentage rises to 86.7%.
The main reasons given for school dropouts included lack of school dues, pregnancy, early marriage, lack of interest in education and orphanhood, as shown in the graph below.

These findings point to economic factors which influence educational decisions, but also to poor attitudes towards education, both by parents and children alike. District officials stress the significant role that ignorance plays in contributing to school dropout rates.

28.5% of households indicate that one or more members of the household have never attended school.

‘Wealthy’ households have fewer incidences of household members never attending school. Approximately 30% of households in all wealth groups, except the ‘wealthy’ one, reported that one
or more household never attended school. The percentage drops to 23.4% for ‘wealthy’ households. In terms of household deprivations, households with more deprivations indicate higher proportions of households with members who never attended school compared to those with fewer deprivations. 57.9% of severely deprived households report having one or more members who never attended school. In non-deprived households, only 20.2% indicate one or more members never went to school.

**Chart 5.13: Never attended school within LLGs**

According to the map below, the LLG with the highest percentage concentration of household members never attending school is Munkunyu. Other LLGs with high density of households in which one or more members never attended school are Nyakiyumbu, Bwesumbu and Buhuhira. LLGs with the lowest percentages concentration of households with members who never attended school are Bulembia division, Kitholhu, Katwe Kabatoro and Central division.
The main reasons given for never attending school are lack of school fees, lack of interest in education, parental decision, orphanhood and disability. Other reasons include marriage, pregnancy, alcoholism and child not of school going age. According to district officials, peer influence and ignorance are also significant factors influencing school non-attendance.
The importance of quality education in terms of improving livelihoods and assisting households to escape poverty is unquestioned, but the challenge of delivering quality education, particularly to the poor, and making it truly accessible is significant. With the district’s high population growth, the number of schools, teachers, desks, pit latrines and other scholastic requirements will need to double in the next 20 years, if the current standards are to be maintained. However, to continue improving the standards of education infrastructure and staffing levels must be more than doubled.

The findings in this chapter show that educational decisions among district residents are not only based on financial implications, but also have to do with the perceived quality of education on offer and with attitudes of household members towards the importance of education. Since it is the poor who are most likely to absent themselves and drop out of school, initiatives to help the poorest access quality education need to be developed. Improving the quality of education, sensitising the district population to the importance of education, as well as improving household income in order to afford better education are thus highlighted as key educational need throughout the district.
Chapter 6:

Health

Key findings

• Poor households and those most deprived are worse off, compared to the better-off wealth groups, when it comes to accessing quality health facilities. Not only do they generally have to travel further to the nearest health facility, but the quality of the service received is often poor or very poor. Moreover, due to their financial limitations, they are less likely to be able to choose private or better quality alternatives.

• Public (government and co-managed) health centres are the nearest facilities for 85.4% households, with HC II being the closest facilities for most households.

• The quality of most of the health facilities is categorized as good (38.0%), though urban LLGs have better quality health facilities compared to rural LLGs. Poor households and those with the most deprivations tend to be less critical of the quality of health care. The highest concentration of very poor quality facilities are in Bwesumbu, Bugoye, Mahango, Maliba, Nyakiyumbu, Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Buhuhira, Rukoki and Karusandara.

• The coverage of health facilities is generally good in the district. The majority of the households (59.4%) generally travel between 1 and 4 kms to access a health facility, which is an acceptable standard in Uganda. Nevertheless, a significant number of households (17.3%), particularly in rural LLGs, travel more than 5 kms to the nearest health facility.

• Poor households and those most deprived travel further than those from the better-off wealth groups. Munkunyu, Kyarumba, Kyondo, Lake Katwe, Mahango, Rukoki, Nyakiyumbu, Maliba, Buhuhira and Bwesumbu have the highest concentration of households who must travel longer more than 5 kms to reach the closest health centre.

• Most households (76.7%) attend the nearest government health facility. A higher proportion of households within the ‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ wealth groups attend the nearest public health facility than those in the better-off wealth groups. The most prominent reasons for not attending the nearest government health facility are lack of drugs, poor quality services and the long distances to reach these facilities.

• The main source of information and guidance on health issues is the local council one (LC1).

Context

In his 2001 address to the World Health Assembly, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan stated that “[t]he biggest enemy of health in the developing world is poverty”. Poverty creates ill-health because it forces people to live in environments that make them sick, without decent shelter, clean water or adequate sanitation. Poverty creates hunger, which in turn leaves people vulnerable to disease. Poverty denies people access to reliable health services and affordable medicines, and causes children to miss out on routine vaccinations. Poverty creates illiteracy, leaving people poorly informed about health risks and forcing them into dangerous jobs, that harm their health.
Moreover, in Uganda a direct relationship has been demonstrated between poverty and incidence and prevalence of a number of diseases, as they are more prevalent among the poor compared to the rich (MOH, ____). It is against this background that health was included in this poverty study.

Given the objectives of the Health Sector Strategic Plan to increase accessibility to health facilities to within 5kms walking distance, especially in hard-to-reach areas and the Ministry of Health’s commitment to increase the number of available government health facilities, this chapter looks at the type and quality of health facilities accessible to households throughout the district. It also explores attendance rates and the distances residents have to walk to access health facilities, since this has a bearing on one’s preference of the type of health care source utilised.

For the purpose of this study, public health centres are categories as government and co-managed or funded facilities.

**Type and quality of health facilities**

Findings from the Uganda National Household Survey 2009/2010 indicate that the proportion of government health units located within communities had doubled from 7% in 2005/2006 to 14% in 2009/10. Results from this study seem to support those findings, showing that for 85.4% of households the nearest health facility is public (government or co-managed or funded), compared to 14.6% of household who reported private health facilities being closer.

![Chart 6.1: Nearest health facility type](image)

40.7% of the nearest public facilities are HC IIs, 34.9% are HC IIs, while HC IV and hospitals make up 6.0% and 12.4% respectively.
As per the chart below, overall, the quality of the nearest health facility is ranked as good by the large proportion of households (38%), closely followed by those who deem the nearest health facilities to be of moderate quality (37.7%). 15.4% of households considered the quality of the health facility closest to them to be poor, while 3.6% of households thought the quality was very poor and only 5.3% suggested it was very good.

In terms of wealth groups, poor households and those with the most deprivations tend to be less critical of the quality of health care. However, within all wealth groups and household deprivations, the proportion of those who believe the quality to be very good is relatively small.

On the whole, health facilities in urban LLGs were ranked higher for good quality and lower for poor quality. This means that health facilities in urban LLGs are considered better than those in rural LLGs.
As seen in the graph below, the hard-to-reach LLGs of Mahango, Bwesumbu and Buhuhira have relatively high proportions of households indicating that the nearest health facilities are of very poor and poor quality compared to others within the LLGs. By contrast, the highest percentages of households in Mpondwe Lhubiriha, Bulembia division, Kyondo and Hima stating that the nearest health facilities are of good or very good quality.

Chart 6.4: Quality of the nearest health facility within LLGs

According to the map below, across the district, Bwesumbu has the highest concentration of households indicating the nearest health facilities is ranked very poor, followed by Bugoye and Mahango.
This highlights the need to improve the quality of health facilities, especially for those in rural LLGs, to ensure that more equitable service delivery.

**Distance to health facilities**

According to this study, 59.4% of households travel between 1-4 kms to access the nearest health facility, while 23.4% travel less than 1 km and the remaining 17.3% travel more than 5 kms to access health services. The latter group of households travel longer than the Ugandan average distance of 5 kms.
This is the case for poor households who are at a greater disadvantage compared to better-off ones. In fact, among those who have to travel more than 5 kms to the nearest health facility, 87.7% belong to the poor wealth groups compared to 12.3% of households from the better-off wealth groups.

Within wealth groups and household deprivation, the distribution of households according to the distance they must travel to the nearest health facility is shown in the graph below. In all wealth groups, the largest proportion of households travels between 1-4 kms to the nearest health facility. In the ‘extremely poor’ wealth group a relatively high percentage travel more than 5 kms to the nearest health facility and only a small percentage travel less than 1 km.

Analysis of household deprivations indicates similar findings. The largest proportion of households, in all household deprivation groups, travel between 1-4 kms to the nearest health facility, though larger proportions of households with more deprivations have to walk more than 5 kms to the closest health facility compared to those with fewer deprivations.

Chart 6.5: Distance to the nearest health facility within wealth groups and household deprivations

As indicated in the graph below, the majority of the households within each LLG travel between 1 to 4kms to access health facilities. This is not the case for Kyondo and Lake Katwe where the larger proportion of households travels more than 5kms to access a health facility.
The map below shows the district concentration of households who have to travel more than 5 kms to the nearest health facility.

Munkunyu has the highest concentration of households who must travel more than 5 kms to reach the nearest health centre (10.3%), closely followed by Kyarumba (10.1%), Kyondo (10.0%), and then Lake Katwe (8.1%) and Mahango (7.6%).

Fewer households in Isango, Mpondwe Lhubiriha and Bulembia division have to travel 5 kms to reach the nearest health facility.
Not surprisingly, fewer households in all LLGs have to walk more than 5 kms to access the nearest health facility.

**Attendance of health facilities**

The majority of respondents (76.7%) attend the nearest government facility when sick.
83.7% of ‘extremely poor’ and ‘moderately poor’ households attend the nearest government health facility compared to 16.3% of households in the better-off wealth groups.

However, the distribution of households attending the nearest government health facility within wealth groups and according to household deprivation is shown in the graph below. The greatest proportion of households, within all wealth groups and all household deprivation groups, attend the nearest government health facility. However, more better-off and non-deprived households attend non-government run health facility compared to poor and more deprived households.

These findings are not surprising, and are likely due to the fact that poor and more deprived households cannot afford the more expensive private health facilities. However, they indicate the importance of government health facilities particularly to poor households, and the need to ensure that the poor are adequately provided for in terms of health provision.
In general terms, slightly more households from rural LLGs (77.5%) attend government health facilities, compared to their counterparts from the urban LLGs (72.5%). These results concur with the earlier findings of UBOS, 2010 that established the same trend. This could be attributed to the fact that households in the urban setting have easier access to private health facilities, which they deem to be of better quality.

Within all LLGs, the majority of households attend the nearest government health facility, though the percentage varies. For example, in Bwera 96.9% of households attend the closest government health facility, while in Kisinga the percentage drops to 54.8%.

As shown in the graph below, the main reasons advanced for failure to attend the nearest government health facility were, among others, lack of drugs (39.1%), poor quality of services (25.2%) and long distances (24.7%).

These reasons highlight some of the weaknesses of government health facilities, and demonstrate the need to improve the quality of health services, and ensure that the necessary services are consistently available to district residents, particularly the poor who have few alternatives to public health facilities.
Source of health information and guidance

The main source of information and guidance on health issues are local council (LC1) and the radio.

As indicated by the graph below, whereas the majority of households from rural LLGs (50.5%) receive information and guidance from LC1, most households from urban LLGs (45.1%) receive the same from the radio.

The same trend is observed for the wealth groups and for household deprivations. ‘Extremely poor’ households, and those most deprived, received information and guidance from LC1, while most of the ‘wealthy’ households, and those without deprivations, used the radio to receive health information from the radio.
The provision of healthcare is one of the central responsibilities government has to its citizens. However, the district’s high population growth rate will place tremendous demands on the provision of healthcare. With a population doubling every 20 years, the provision of health service must also double simply to keep existing standards. Though, in the long-term such investments must take place, given the financial implications of constructing and suitably effectively equipping health facilities, alternative short and mid-term solutions, that especially meet the health needs of the poor, need to be considered.

This study has shown that for poorer households in particular sickness is not only one of the most common threats to livelihoods, but one of the most overwhelming effects of poverty. Ill-health hampers households’ ability to earn a living and treatment drains the often meagre household incomes. As such, preventing households from becoming sick and ensuring they are able to cope with sudden health shocks are perhaps the most effective ways of reaching the poor.

By exploiting local village gatherings and community networks, efforts can be made to sensitisise the community and encourage uptake of preventive health measures. Moreover, by encouraging membership to savings and credit groups, poor household can be helped to be able to cover the cost of preventive health care or meet the cost of treatment when ill-health strikes.
Chapter 7:

Vulnerable groups

Key findings

The elderly

- Due to the breakdown of the traditionally protective structures, such as families and social customs and networks, the elderly are often left particularly exposed to poverty. Whereas in the past the elderly would be looked after in their old age, they now face an economically insecure future, especially as many are forced to look after dependents, for example grandchildren or disabled relatives. The elderly have limited or no income and, despite limitations that age brings, must often engage in economic activities so as to meet their own basic needs as well as those in their care. Moreover, lack of respect and negative attitudes towards the elderly, keep them isolate from the very social structures and norms meant to support them, heightening their vulnerability.

- 86.7% of elderly people consider themselves to be ‘poor’ or ‘extremely poor’, and 90.0% of them believe their economic situation had deteriorated in the past 5 years.

- Low income, followed by ill-health, food shortages, neglect by relatives and payment of school fees are the main challenges faced by the elderly, which are overcome by resorting to subsistence farming, selling excess crops, seeking support from other relatives or engaging in petty jobs.

- 69.2% of elderly people perceive the community’s attitude towards them to be negative.

PWD

- Over the past 5 years improvements in the well-being of PWDs in Kasese have been recorded. That said, they still face tremendous challenges, especially given the limited income generating activities available to them. Unequal access to public services and discriminatory attitudes towards PWDs have thwarted their earning abilities. More organised than others into social and support groups, PWDs still face significant hardships in accessing quality and non-discriminatory public services and in competing with the able-bodied for employment opportunities. Frequently reliant on others to meet their basic needs, the lack of income appropriate generating activities is perhaps the issue that makes them most susceptible to poverty.

- 44.8% of PWD suggest their economic situation over the past 5 years has improved. 34.5% indicate it has worsened while 20.7% say it has remained the same.

- The main challenges faced by PWDs are low incomes due to their disabilities, discrimination in the job market, dependence on others, ill-health and chronic pain, and long distances to and inaccessibility of public services and utilities.

- 56.7% of PWDs indicate that community’s attitude towards them are negative. PWDs are regarded with suspicion and contempt, and are viewed as helpless, unable to contribute economically, cursed by God, and community members often resort to verbally abusing and name calling of PWDs.
• 73.3% of PWDs are members of a PWD support group. These are said to provide empowerment, reduction of social stigma, knowledge about and access to credit and saving schemes and material support.

Young people

• Given the very youthful structure of the growing population in Kasese, and the impact that demographic issues have on development, the vulnerabilities of young people cannot be ignored. With poor educational achievements, limited vocational training and economic opportunities, insufficient resources, such as land, and limited access to family planning and reproductive health programmes, young people face tremendous challenges to their current and future well-being. All too often, due to lack of parental guidance, school fees and productive engagement, the youth are idle leading to unwanted pregnancies, early marriage, risky exposure to HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases, and to anti-social behaviour (e.g. alcoholism, drug abuse) and crime.

• 30% of youths consider their economic situation over the past 5 years to have worsened, while 25% believe it has improved. 10% state it has remained the same and 5% are not sure.

• The main challenges young people face are lack of income and economic opportunities, lack of basic needs, particularly school fees, lack of land, neglect from parents and lack of access to government programmes.

• 63.1% of young people are not sure whether they will inherit land from their parents. Reasons for this include insufficient land to be divided among many children and parental disinterest.

• Alcoholism and drug abuse are the main anti-social behaviours that young people are involved in. Others include early pregnancies and marriages, crime and prostitution.

Child-headed households

• Very little research exists, at district level, on the issues facing child-headed households, but this vulnerable group faces some of the most severe hardships. Caught between childhood and the responsibilities of managing a household, these children lack the income opportunities and resources to adequately meet the basic needs of their households. Reliant mostly on others, child-headed households are vulnerable to poor health, food insecurity and to abuse. With little hope of attaining a high educational standard their chances of future productive employment are slight. As mentioned previously, the breakdown of the traditional protective social systems has further rendered this population group extremely vulnerable to poverty and exploitation.

• 85.4% of child-headed households believe themselves to be ‘poor’ or ‘extremely poor’. 71.4% say their economic situation, over the past 5 years, has worsened.

• The main challenges faced by child-headed households are the inability to meet their basic needs (including education, health and shelter), lack of income and employment, lack of land, and the overburdening of the child head by work. Well over ¼ of respondents suggested they had no means of coping with the challenges they face.

Women and female-headed households

• Despite their significant contribution to agriculture and to the well-being of their families, women in Kasese face a number of constraints which render them vulnerable to poverty. Moreover, as seen in Chapter 2, the fact that households headed by singles, divorcees and widows are more likely to be poor, highlights the particular susceptibility of female-headed households to hardships and poverty. Unequal power relations, resulting in women's
dependence on men for decision making, ownership and control over household assets and income, greatly hampers women’s involvement in productive activities and restricts their contribution to economic development. Furthermore, in spite of efforts to address this issue, low educational attainments among women further render them susceptible to unemployment or underemployment and poor standards of living.

- Compared to five years ago, 40.7% of women and female-headed households indicate their economic situation has largely improved. For 33.3% of women it has remained unchanged, whereas the remaining 25.9% have seen a worsening of their economic situation.

- The main challenges faced by women and female-headed households are low earning due to limited access to income generating opportunities, not being productively employed, being economically dependent on others, owning limited or no land, shouldering many different responsibilities, having limited control over productive assets and limited decision-making powers.

- Men control and own the majority of household income and assets.

- 42% of women in the district are literate, compared to 52% of men.

PLWHA

- Stigma and discrimination towards people living with HIV and AIDS is the single most significant challenge PLWHA face in the district. Despite the high incidences of HIV and AIDS in Kasese, poor attitudes towards PLWHA lead to secrecy about the disease, hindering prevention and treatment efforts, generate a sense of isolation among PLWHA, and hamper their opportunities to be economically productive. The knock on effect of stigma and discrimination on PLWHA’s earning capacity cannot be underestimated, and result in a cycle of rejection/isolation, low earnings and ill-health.

- 57.2% of PLWHA perceive their economic situation to have improved over the past 5 years.

- Stigma and discrimination, low income, irregular health and poor feeding are the main challenges of PLWHA.

- 42.9% of PLWHA say attitudes towards them are negative, 23.8% think they are indifferent, while 33.3% suggested attitudes are supportive.

- Of those on ARVs, 47.6% of PLWA reported difficulties in access the ARVs, while the majority (52.4%) indicated easier access. For those not on ARVs, the main reasons for non-usage are lack of drugs and drugs not yet required.

Context

Vulnerability to poverty means having a high probability of either becoming poor or of remaining in poverty. The vulnerable, therefore, are those not currently poor, but likely to be pushed into poverty when faced with a shock or a change in circumstances, and the poor who are unable to lift themselves out of poverty. Previous district studies have highlighted the vulnerability of certain population groups, including women, children and youth, the elderly, the chronically sick and the disabled.

The vulnerability of these sections of the community was further reinforced by the views of respondents of this study. The population group most deemed to be vulnerable was the elderly, followed by people with disabilities (PWD) and young people.
Unemployment and underemployment are widespread in Kasese, resulting in low incomes and high rates of poverty (KDLG, 2011). Unemployment and underemployment, of both skilled and unskilled labour, particularly affects women and young people. According to the District Development Plan, youths completing their education take between 3-5 years to find meaningful employment.

In this chapter, the peculiar characteristics of each of these vulnerable population groups, and their susceptibilities to poverty, are examined. Subjective data, drawn from qualitative questionnaires conducted with households from each of the vulnerable groups, is predominantly used supported, where possible, by statistical analysis.

The assessments of household wealth, which appear in each of the sections of this chapter, are not the same as those arrived at by the wealth index. Rather they are the self-assessment of vulnerable households’ own wealth status and that of their parish, drawn from qualitative questionnaires and FGDs and not from the quantitative questionnaire.

The elderly

Traditionally, as people aged they were taken care of by family structures, social networks and norms. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that these social security nets are being eroded and rather than being protected, the elderly are all too frequently neglected, abused and forced to struggle for their survival, while often carrying the burden of looking after their grandchildren. Moreover, despite their contributions, according to the District Development Plan, the elderly in Kasese are marginalised and left out of the district’s development process (KDLG, 2011).

30 elderly people, from different LLGS, participated in this study.

All of those interviewed resided with relatives though 90.0% of them were responsible for looking after the children of the household or of their extended family.

In order to meet their basic requirements, respondents predominantly engaged in crop farming, followed by relying on relatives for support, a pension and charity from within the community.
Generally, the elderly rate their own wealth status more pessimistically compared to their assessment of the parish’s wealth status. 30% of respondents suggest they are ‘extremely poor’ while 56.7% consider themselves to be ‘poor’, compared to the wealth status of the parish, which is believed to be made up of 6.7% of ‘extremely poor’ households and 50.0% of ‘poor’ households. The situation is reversed when it comes to ‘self-sufficient’ households with a large percentage of households within the parish believed to be in this wealth group (43.3%) and only 13.3% of elderly households ranked in the same wealth group. No respondents assessed either their own or their parish’s wealth status as ‘wealthy’.

The vast majority of elderly people state that, over the past 5 years, their economic situation has declined. 76.7% of respondents report that their economic situation over the last 5 years has worsened a little, 13.3% suggest it is much worse now, 6.7% indicate it is much better and 3.3% say it has remained the same.
The main reasons they give for the worsening situation include the high cost of living, unexpected family expenditure, lack of a permanent job or income generating activities and having many dependents.

34.9% of respondents suggest that having a low income is the main challenge they face. This is followed by sickness, food shortages, neglect by their relatives and payment of school fees. As previously mentioned, though weak and, in theory, economically inactive the elderly bear the burden of having to provide some or all of the basic needs of their children or grandchildren.

In order to overcome these challenges, the elderly mainly resort to subsistence farming and to selling any excess to cover immediate needs, such as school fees or treatment for illness. Respondents also suggest that they seek support from other relatives or engage in other simple work, which will earn some resources. Some fall back on loans, while others indicate that they struggle to come up with any coping mechanism.
According to findings, the community’s attitude towards the elderly is generally perceived to be negative (69.2%). Though 26.9% of respondents found attitudes towards them to be somewhat supportive, a staggering 61.5% felt attitudes were somewhat negative, 7.7% very negative and the remaining 3.8% experienced indifferent towards them.

Despite the perceived poor attitude towards the elderly, most respondents were still actively involved in community roles, such as church leadership and elderly councils. Those not involved in such activities indicated lack of energy, time and money as factors preventing their participation.

Slightly less than ½ of respondents indicated that they are involved in a support group for the elderly.
Those involved in a support group for the elderly cite socialising, the acquisition of soft loans and skills training as the main benefits of group membership.

For those not involved in a local support group, the main reasons given for non-participation are lack of funds to contribute to group saving scheme, no group in the area, general weakness and occupied with personal business. Almost \( \frac{1}{3} \) of respondents indicate no benefit is gained by group membership (29.4%).

Notwithstanding the mixed reception support groups received, formation of groups for the elderly was the most mentioned intervention to assist the elderly. This was followed by support for agriculture, trainings, the acquisition of loans, elders’ salaries and projects.

The main benefits gained from these interventions include boosting income and self-reliance of the elderly, creating awareness about improved agricultural practices and gaining skills.
The institutions implementing such interventions were elders, government, SACCOs, NGOs and joint implementation by government and NGOs.

Chart 7.10: Implementing institutions

With regards to what more needs to be done to assist the elderly, respondents suggested the following: modernisation of agriculture, provision of safe drinking water, housing schemes for the elderly, provision of free health services and improved roads.

People with disabilities

According to the District Development Plan, PWDs remain politically, physically, socially and economically disadvantaged (KDLG, 2011). They do not have equal access to public services and are constrained from accessing the economic opportunities which could enable them to improve their livelihoods and well-being. It is suggested that most PWDs in the district either rely on relatives for their existence or survive by begging, living hand-to-mouth.

Given the vulnerabilities of this population group, the views of 30 people with disabilities, from different LLGs, were included in this study. Perhaps reflecting the dominance of physical disability within the disabled population of the district, of those interviewed, all presented physical, rather than mental disabilities.

73.4% of respondents indicated that their disability was the result of an accident, illness or a land mine. These figures point to the preventability of a significant percentage of disabilities in the district. Curbing of accidents, particularly road accidents, and improving the quality of treatment, especially of common and preventable diseases, could significantly reduce the incidence of disabilities in the district.

76.7% of respondents suggested that their disability prevents them from participating in normal household activities, while 56.7% indicate that their disability hampers them from earning a living. For those not able to earn a living, the vast majority rely on their relatives to look after them and provide for their needs (93.3%), while others counted on savings and investments made prior to being disabled. This shows that social bonds play a big role in providing for the needs of PWDs.

For those able to earn a living, trade and commerce is the main occupation, followed by crop farming and engaging in casual labour.
Not surprising, 76.7% state that the income they generate from the above occupations is not sufficient to meet their basic needs, and that incomes are supplemented by petty trading, livestock rearing, casual labouring and small scale agricultural production.

PWDs assessed the wealth of their parish, at the extreme ends of the wealth scale, to be more optimistic than that of their own wealth assessments. For example, 20% of respondents consider themselves to be ‘extremely poor’ compared to the parish average of 6.7%. Also, no respondents classified themselves as ‘wealthy’, whereas they believed 13.3% of parish households to be so. However, in terms of the middling wealth groups (‘poor’ and ‘self-sufficient’), respondents rated their own wealth status as being similar to that of their parish.
44.8% of PWD respondents indicate that their economic situation over the past 5 years has generally improved. For 3.4% this has been a significant improvement, while for 41.4% the improvement has been more modest.

**Chart 7.13: Change in economic situation**

This improvement in economic situation for PWDs could be accounted for by the increased focus in planning and programming for PWDs across the district. In fact, reasons given for improved economic welfare include having income generating activities, attracting high prices for a high coffee production, having few dependents and support from NGOs.

However, despite this positive development, more still needs to be done as 34.5% reported a worsening of their economic situation, and are thus not being reached by pro-PWD programmes. Reasons offered for worsening economic situation included owning no income generating activities, the high cost of living, incurring unexpected household expenses, lack of land and being affected by landslides.

The study suggests that the main challenge faced by PWDs is low incomes due to their disabilities restricting involvement in certain economic activities, which require greater physical strength or mobility. Other significant challenges include discrimination in the job market, dependence on others, sickness and chronic pain, and the long distances to and inaccessibility of public services and utilities.
These findings are supported by other studies, which suggest that due to a number of factors PWDs often earn less than able bodied individuals (KADUPEDI, 2011). PWDs face physical, financial and attitudinal barriers in accessing health and education, and thus are often less physical fit to work and less educated or skilled. This means that PWDs can be less competitive in the workforce marketplace, or if qualified, are frequently discriminated against.

To cope with the challenge, respondents indicate that they predominantly rely on help from relatives or friends. They also engage in casual labouring, rely on petty less strenuous jobs, and seek to sensitise the community.
More than half the respondents indicated that the community’s attitude towards PWDs is not positive (56.7%), indicating that the community still holds prejudices towards PWDs. Other district studies suggest that negative attitudes are prevalent in the community (KADUPEDI, 2011). PWDs are regarded with suspicion and contempt, and are viewed as helpless, unable to contribute economically, cursed by God, and community members often resort to verbally abusing and name calling of PWDs.

Chart 7.16: Community response to PWDs

73.3% of respondents reported being a member of a PWD support group.

Chart 7.17: Membership of PWD support groups

While a small percentage of respondents indicated that they do not receive any benefit from participation in such a group, the majority benefit in a number of ways. These include empowerment and the reduction of social stigma, knowledge about and access to credit and saving schemes and the provision of material support (e.g. provision of livestock or donor funds).
The reasons given for non-involvement in a PWD support group include seeing no advantage to being a member, no group present in the area, poor group administration and too weak to participate.

As per the graph below, interventions being carried out to assist PWDs include provision of productive assets, provision of assistive devices, grants to PWD groups, provision of material support and UPE and USE. A small percentage of respondents suggested nothing is being done in their communities to assist PWDs (7.1%).

Chart 7.18: Interventions to help PWDs

The reasons given for the effectiveness of these interventions include improving the mobility of PWDs, enhancing their livelihoods and incomes, improving their skills and access to capital, and strengthening their human rights.

The above interventions are predominantly implemented by government, followed by NGOs and then by government and NGOs jointly.

Chart 7.19: Implementing institutions
In terms of what more can be done to assist PWDs, respondents suggest that more of the same is required, particularly focussing on access to low interest loans, provision of productive assets, assistive devices and vocational training.

**Young people**

According to a recent report, Uganda's demographic profile is one of the country's most striking development challenges (Daumerie and Leahy Madsen, 2010). The fast growing and very young population impact economic development, the quality of health care and education, and through high rates of unemployment influence social and political stability and security. Young people (between 12-30 years of age) constitute approximately 43% of the district’s population. The District Development Plan suggests that, while most of them live rurally, there has been a significant migration of young people towards urban centres, where the public amenities and economic opportunities are perceived to be better (KDLG, 2011). Moreover, it states that the poor educational attainment and skills of youths throughout the district, and the lack of productive economic opportunities, makes them vulnerable to poverty.

This section looks at the challenges of young people in the district, and explores their attitudes and knowledge concerning reproductive health and issues of HIV and AIDS. 20 young people were interviewed for this study from across the district.

60.0% of respondents indicated they were not currently attending school. Of these, 62.5% were involved in crop farming, 25.0% in petty trade, while 12.5% were idle with no meaningful occupation.

![Chart 7.20: Main occupation of young people](image)

Generally, young people held a positive perception of their own wealth status, especially compared to their parish.

The majority of youths rated themselves as ‘self-sufficient’ (78.9%), with 15.8% ranking themselves as ‘extremely poor’ and only a small percentage as ‘moderately poor’ (5.3%). None perceived their wealth status to be ‘wealthy’.
30% of youths consider their economic situation over the past 5 years to have worsened, while 25% believe it has improved. Of the remainder, 10% state it has remained the same and 5% are not sure.

No reasons were put forward to account for their worsening situation, but those whose economic welfare has improved put it down primarily to being economically productive through new or enhanced income generating activities.

The majority of youths indicate that lack of income and economic opportunities is their main challenge (36.4%). This is followed by lack of basic needs, particularly school fees (15.2%), lack of land, neglect from parents and lack of access to government programmes. Also cited were unwanted pregnancies, imprisonment and the lack of respect their ideas have in the community.
The lack of income and productive employment opportunities for youths in the district is a serious challenge, and according to respondents is the main hindrance to their setting up of their own household. Moreover, the lack of school fees renders young people more vulnerable as their chances of future gainful employment, without education or skills, are further reduced.

With regards to the challenge of insufficient land, 63.1% of respondents suggested they were not sure whether they would be inheriting land from their parents. The main reason given for was that land is insufficient yet the number of children among whom the land would be distributed is large. Other reasons included parents disinterest in giving land to their children and young people having already been given their land inheritance.
Even for those who were sure of inheriting land, 86.7% indicated that the land would be insufficient to sustain the needs of the future household. With no land to look forward to, the future security of young people is at risk.

Unfortunately, lack of parental guidance, the sense of hopelessness about the future and the lack of meaningful productive engagement results in idleness, and can often lead to anti-social behaviours. Large numbers of respondents suggested that alcoholism and drug abuse were the main anti-social behaviours that young people are involved in. Others include early pregnancies and marriages, crime and prostitution.

To overcome some of these challenges, the majority of young people simply rely on relatives or friends for support. Others engage in casual labour, seek economic opportunities elsewhere, lobby leaders and take out loans to meet their needs.
Given that unwanted pregnancies is one of the main challenges cited by young people and that young people fall within the productive population group most affected by morbidity and mortality due to HIV and AIDS, this study sought to perceive youths’ knowledge of and access to reproductive health programmes and HIV and AIDS issues.

Respondents indicated that reproductive health messages are received primarily from teachers, followed by health educators, Straight Talk, women counsellors and local leaders. 77.8% of respondents suggested that they have access to modern contraceptive methods, with condoms being the most used method (72.0%). This means that the majority of females are more exposed to family planning challenges, which in turn could affect population growth and school dropout rates. Those who do not access family planning reported that lack of availability of modern contraceptives and lack of information about proper use were the main reasons for not making use of family planning.

With regards to HIV and AIDS, findings reveal that most youths have a reasonable knowledge about the facts and prevention of HIV and AIDS.

When asked about the community’s attitude towards young people, the majority perceived the response to be supportive (45.0%). 35.0% of respondents believed the community’s attitude towards them to be on the whole negative (somewhat and very negative), while the remaining 20% thought the attitude towards them was indifferent.

Chart 7.27: Community attitude towards young people

The reasons given for the community holding negative views about youths included the belief that young people are not productive, the fact that they are dependent and thus a burden to others and the fact that they are involved in crime.

The main interventions identified to help the youth were UPE and USE, the provision of NAADS inputs and guidance and counselling. Other additional interventions included youth leadership programmes, VSLAs and SACCOs, support of games and sports and the formation of clubs and groups for young people. A relatively small percentage of young people suggested nothing was being done to help them.
The institutions implementing the above programmes are mainly government and government and NGOs jointly.

Regarding what more could be done for young people, respondents’ suggestions included involvement in income generating activities, training in vocational skills and assistance in budgeting and planning for business set up.

**Child-headed households**

Children (below 18 years of age) constitute more than ½ the district’s population. Many of these are categorised as vulnerable, including, but not limited to orphans, those affected or infected by HIV and AIDS, street children, child mothers, and those abandoned, neglected or abused. Children in charge of providing and caring for their own household are among the most vulnerable, and are thus covered by this study.
7 children heads of households were interviewed for this study. The sample size is very small, but nonetheless is able to highlight some of the struggles encountered by child-headed households.

Various reasons were provided as to why the child was heading a household. The majority of respondents reported that they head a household as a result of the separation of their parents. 28.6% suggest that the death of both parents precipitated their taking up the household head responsibility, while the remaining respondents put the reasons down to the death of one parent or dropping out of school (both 14.3%).

Though the sample size is small, these results suggest a breakdown of the social fabric which normally upholds the needs of and protects children.

On average, 3.4 people live in the household headed by a child, and the child has been in charge of the household for typically 2.3 years.

42.9% of respondents indicate that, despite their responsibilities, they attend school.
The majority pay for their own fees, while 33.3% rely on relatives to cover the cost. Reasons given for non-attendance include the inability to afford school fees and the need to look after their siblings.

In order to meet their basic needs, 42.9% of respondents state that they engage in petty trade, 33.3% engage in casual labour while the remaining 16.7% rely on subsistence farming.

The fact that children heading households must engage in such activities means that their attention is diverted from school attendance. This makes them vulnerable to dropping out of schools and in future will make them less competitive in the labour marketplace.

Child-headed households assessed their own wealth status to be predominantly ‘extremely poor’ (71.4%), An equal number considered themselves ‘poor’ or ‘self-sufficient’ (14.3%) while no respondent thought of their economic status as being ‘wealthy’.
The vast majority of respondents indicated that economic situation, over the past 5 years, has worsened (71.4%). Of these, 57.1% suggest a slight worsening of their economic welfare, while for 14.3% the decline has been significant. The economic situation of only 14.3% of respondents has improved over the past 5 years.

Reasons provided for a decline in economic welfare include the high cost of living, unexpected household expenditures, the pursuit of education and being supported by others due to the lack of productive employment

The main challenges faced by child-headed households were identified as lack of food, lack of school fees, the inability to meet medical bills, lack of income and employment, lack of shelter and land, and child head overburdened by work.
In order to overcome the challenges, respondents indicated that they predominantly rely on support from relatives or neighbours, they engage in casual labour to earn some additional income, they engage in crop farming for household consumption and sell any surplus production. Well over $\frac{1}{4}$ of respondents suggested they had no means of coping with the challenges they faced, significantly increasing their vulnerability.

When asked whether adult relatives resided in the same parish, 85.7% of respondents indicated that they did; however, they further revealed that only 28.6% of these were trying to help the child-headed household, in the form of advice. Respondents suggested that those not helping were either unwilling or too poor to do anything.
For the past 6 years, 17 year old Zaina Rashid, who lives in Muhokya, has headed her own household, which includes 5 younger female relatives. With no home of their own, they are grateful for the borrowed mud and thatched house in which they live. Through struggles and perseverance, Zaina provides for the family by way of petty trading of food items, which yield an income of approximately UGX 20,000 per week. This modest income is supplemented by revenue gained from Zaina hiring out her labour to others in order to meet medical bills, school dues and other necessary costs. “Our main challenges are lack of food, as we are only able to consume one meal per day, lack of scholastic materials and the cost of medical treatment when we are sick”.

Despite the extremely challenging conditions the family live under, Zaina has resolved to meet these difficulties through hard work and determination. She sees education as something vital to escaping poverty: “Four of my sisters are in school and I myself have completed O level. I would like to continue my education and join a vocational institution to help me get a job and increase my income generating opportunities”. She also hopes one day to be able to be able to build a house for the family on the plot of land her grandfather left her.

Women and female-headed households

In Kasese, women contribute meaningfully to agriculture, to economic development and to the welfare of their families and communities. However, they often face a number of constraints which limit their involvement and impact in these areas. For example, women are responsible for more than 80.0% of the district’s agricultural production yet own less that 7.0% of the land on which this production takes place (KDLG, 2011).

Several studies have shown that unemployment and low earnings, as well as low literacy levels leave women particularly vulnerable to poverty, and that their lack of ownership of and control over productive resources is a significant cause of rural poverty in Uganda.

This section looks at the vulnerability of women, particularly female-headed households. In this context, a female-headed household is defined as one in which a woman, be she a single person, one separated from her husband or partner, a divorcee or a widow, is primarily responsible for meeting the needs and ensuring the welfare of a given household.

30 women, heads of households, from a number of different LLGs, were sampled for this study.

Results show that the main source of income of female-headed household is predominantly crop farming and trading. However, since these sources of income are not sufficient to meet the needs of households, income is supplemented primarily through subsistence cultivation, through support from relatives, through hiring out labour to others and through petty trade.

In comparison to the wealth status of their parish, women and female-headed households assessed their own wealth status to be predominantly ‘self-sufficient’ (39.3%), though a significant number perceived themselves to be ‘extremely poor’ (35.7%) or ‘poor’ (25%). No respondent thought of their economic status as being ‘wealthy’.
Respondents perceived their own wealth status as being more pessimistic than that of their parish.

**Chart 7.37: Comparison of parish wealth status and own wealth status**

Compared to five years ago, respondents suggested that their economic situation has largely improved, with 37.0% of respondents indicating a small improvement, and 3.7% reporting a significant improvement. For 33.3% of women their economic situation has remained unchanged, whereas a small proportion state that their situation is a little worse now (7.4%), and a further 18.5% perceive a more significant decline in their economic outlook.

**Chart 7.38: Change in economic situation**

Reasons for improved economic status included high agricultural production (e.g. good coffee harvest and high cotton and coffee prices in 2011), acquisition of land, ownership of own home, few dependents to support, group membership allowing access to soft loans and consistent earnings.
By contrast, the reasons given for a decline in the household's economic situation included unexpected family expenses, lack of land to rent for agriculture, having many dependents to look after, unproductive soil, lack of income-generating activities, sickness and being affected by landslides.

A number of reasons are given as to why women and female-headed households are particularly vulnerable to poverty. These include, but are not limited to, low earning due to having limited access to income generating opportunities or not being productively employed, being economically dependent on others, owning limited or no land, shouldering many different responsibilities, having limited control over productive assets and limited decision-making powers.

Though this main study did not look specifically at income comparisons between men and women, the qualitative surveys, directed at vulnerable groups and LLGs and community leaders, did briefly explore issues of gender control and ownership of assets and incomes. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement that women spend household income more wisely than men. 79.5% of respondents concurred with the statement, while only 20.5% disagreed with it. The main reasons given were that women are economical with household income, they plan well for their home, unlike men who plan for other dependents outside the immediate household, and they do not consume alcohol to the same degree as men.

Moreover, when asked to agree or disagree with the statement that men should control household income and assets, 61.3% of respondents disagreed with the statement, 37.4% agreed that men should control household income and assets, and 1.3% were undecided.

Despite these relatively positive views expressed on women's ability to both handle and control household income and assets, ownership and control of said assets still remains the purview of men throughout the district.

Two different questions were asked regarding ownership of household assets. One presented a list of assets and asked respondents to indicate who owned the asset, while the other asked a more generic question about ownership of all household assets. The two graphs below show the results.
As is shown clearly in both graphs, men are still the predominant owners of household assets in Kasese. Though in some cases both partners jointly own assets, and in a few cases women own certain items, on the whole women are constrained in owning household assets, particularly important productive assets such as land.

The picture is similar when looking at control of household income and assets, though the figures lean slightly more in favour of joint or women’s sole control.

It is clear that unequal power relations, within households, means that are women still largely depend on men for decision making, ownership and control over household assets and income, increasing their vulnerability.

When looking at asset ownership of female-headed households, the graph below shows that the majority of female-headed households own cultivation tools, land and their homes, while fewer households headed by women own livestock, mobile phones and radios. However, the graph also
indicates that some women, who through death, separation or abandonment find themselves heading a household, lack ownership of all household assets making them very vulnerable.

**Chart 7.42: Asset ownership of female-headed households**

Moreover, as seen in the graph below, though the majority of female-headed households control the assets they own, a small percentages of households headed by women do not have control over particular assets (e.g. houses, cultivation tools, mobile phones or land) or share control of the assets with their non-present spouse or son (e.g. radios and land).

**Chart 7.43: Control of assets by female-headed households**

Female-headed households who are asset-poor, in terms of ownership of and control over household assets, are particularly vulnerable to poverty. Such women report that because of a lack productive assets and limited access to capital or income generating opportunities, the
income they earn is not enough to support the basic needs of their household. In order to supplement their incomes, they engage in petty trading, hire out their labour and rely on the support of relatives. However, the burden of caring for a number of dependents is a continued challenge, and makes this population group one of the most susceptible to poverty.

A number of studies indicate that, as well as empowering women through ownership and control of productive assets, increasing the level of education of women is fundamental in reducing women’s susceptibility to poverty.

Though the study did not look directly at this issue, secondary sources were consulted. According to the District Development Plan, 42% of women in the district are literate, compared to 52% of men (KDLG, 2011). The lower level of female literacy is attributed, among others, to the low enrolment rate of girls prior to UPE and USE and the higher dropout rate of girls, especially in rural areas. It has resulted in high morbidity and mortality rates, low standard of living, high levels of unemployment among women and low levels of participation in development initiatives.

Initiatives, such as the Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) programme, are attempting to address this imbalance in literacy levels, though enrolment levels are low, as are attendance rates due to household chores that women must attend to daily.

As seen in the graph below, the main challenges faced by female-headed households include the challenge of taking care of children, psychological distress, limited income, lack of land ownership, illness and poor housing.

In order to cope with the above challenges, women report trying to diversify their livelihood options in order to become self-reliant, receiving support from relatives, government, NGOs, or religious institutions and borrowing as their main coping strategies. 11.8% of respondents indicate no available coping mechanism.
Chart 7.4: Coping mechanisms to overcome challenges

Box 7.2: Case study: Female-headed household

Mbambu Dipora Butusi lives in Kitsutsu I village in Munkunyu with 4 of her children (pictured here). After a protracted illness Mbambu’s husband passed away leaving her to head the family of 7 children.

Limited land and many children are Mbambu’s main challenge. The household survives mainly through subsistence farming, cultivating their own small plot of less than half an acre. Since this barely provides adequate food or income for the family, a kindly neighbour allows them to cultivate an additional plot of land to boost the family’s production. However, even with this additional charitable measure Mbambu’s household predominantly survives on one meal per day.

The cost of ill-health of household members is a further burden to Mbambu, who must hire out her labour to meet these extra costs. Only one of the four children staying with her is being educated, as Mbambu is unable to raise the dues needed to keep the other children in school.

Despite Mbambu’s best efforts to manage the family’s difficult situation, her eldest son, a young man of about 17 years of age, projects a sense of hopelessness. The only way out of their predicament he sees is to get married and start a family of his own, almost inevitably perpetuating the cycle of poverty.

In terms of membership to support groups, results indicate that 72.4% of female-headed households are part of a women’s group.
Those who are part of a women’s group indicated that they benefit from membership through learning how to save, improving agricultural skills and accessing simple loans. A small number suggest they do not benefit in any way. Respondents who are not part of such support groups report that the reasons for this include lack of mobilisation, personal weaknesses, insufficient funds to participate and already being engaged in personal business.

When asked what interventions best assisted women and female-headed households, 50.0% of respondents highlighted NAADS inputs, 25% mentioned the reduced cost of sending children to school due to UPE and USE, 12.5% indicated communal work while the remaining 12.5% suggested that nothing is being done to assist this vulnerable group.

Of those interventions mentioned above, 57.1% pointed to government as the implementing agency, 28.6% to non-governmental organisations and the outstanding 14.3% to community members themselves.
The reasons given for the usefulness of these interventions were reducing the financial burden of paying school fees, increased income and improved agricultural production.

People living with HIV and AIDS

AIDS has had a devastating impact on Uganda. As well as claiming lives and lowering life expectancy, it has reduced Uganda's labour force, reduced agricultural outputs and food security, weakened educational and health services and left countless children orphaned.

Moreover, people living with HIV and AIDS (PLWHA), in Uganda, not only face difficulties related to treatment and management of the disease, they also have to deal with stigma and discrimination, which are a major hindrance to prevention and treatment efforts (Tumushabe, 2006).

This study sampled 21 PLWHA from different LLGs across the district.

Results indicate that the majority of PLWHA (52.9%) survive on cultivation as a main source of livelihood, while the remaining 29.4% depend on trading and 17.6% engage in casual labour. For almost all respondents (95.2%), the income generate from their main economic activity is not enough to support their household's basic needs, and thus they supplement their incomes with much the same activities.
In response to being asked whether their HIV+ status kept them from normal household participation, 85.7% of respondents reported that it did not. Of those that were constrained, the main reasons given were spending a lot of time in bed due to weakness and the negative side effects of ARVs.

In terms of participation in productive activities, 66.7% of respondents indicated that their status does not prevent them from engaging in productive activities. The remaining 33.3% that are constrained, report relying on the assistance of relatives and friends, or not being able to work at all in times of particular weakness.

The majority of PLWHA (66.7%) ranked the wealth status of their parish as ‘self-sufficient’, with 23.8% rating the parish as ‘poor’. A small percentage (4.8%) assessed their parish’s wealth status as ‘wealthy’, with the same percentage ranking the parish as ‘extremely poor’.

When compared to PLWHA’s own assessment of their wealth status, results show that PLWHA have a more pessimistic view of their own wealth status.

Most PLWHA (47.6%) ranked their own wealth status as ‘self-sufficient’, while 38.1% assessed their status as ‘poor’ and 14.3% as ‘extremely poor’. None of the people sampled ranked themselves as ‘wealthy’.
Most PLWHA perceive their economic situation to have improved over the past 5 years. Of these, 42.9% indicate their situation if a bit better, while 14.3% indicate a marked improvement in their financial well-being. For a further 14.3% of PLWHA their change has been a small decline in their economic welfare, whereas 19% suggest a more significant decrease.

The main reasons advanced for a decline in economic situation including lack of income generating activities, unexpected expenditure, inconsistent income due to lack of permanent employment, competition for available jobs, ill-health and weakness due to HIV and AIDS related illnesses.

Reasons given for improved financial well-being included having fewer household dependents, good yields, having an income generating activity, gaining employment, earning consistently and gaining assets.
The most significant challenges PLWHA in Kasese district face are stigma and discrimination (39.3 %), low income/lack of money (15.7 %), irregular health (13.7%) and poor feeding/food shortage (11.8%).

Chart 7.52: Main challenges of PLWHA

The main coping mechanisms that have been put in place to mitigate the above challenges include building up self-confidence (18.6%), seeking treatment and attending counselling (both 14%), engaging in agriculture to boost income and being helped by a relative (both 7%).

Chart 7.53: Coping mechanisms to overcome challenges

When asked about the community's attitude towards PLWHA, 42.9% of respondents reported somewhat negative attitudes towards them, 23.8% indicated that attitudes were indifferent,
while 33.3% suggested that attitudes were fairly supportive, of which a small percentage (9.5%) were very supportive.

Given that stigma and discrimination was mentioned as the most significant challenge faced by PLWHA, it is not surprising to note the somewhat negative attitudes towards those with HIV and AIDS. However, tackling stigma and discrimination remains a challenge in improving prevention and treatment.

Almost all respondents (90.5%) are members of a post-test support group.

The benefits derived from participation in such groups are reported as being guidance and counselling (65%), provision of ARVs (20%) and emotional support (15%). The only reason advanced for not belonging to a post-test club is non-existence of such clubs in their areas.
Results of this study reveal that the overwhelming majority (90.5%) of those interviewed are on anti-retroviral drugs (ARVs). This figure should not be confused with district ARV usage rates, but merely indicates the percentage of respondents on ARVs. It is possible that the high percentage is a result of those sampled being known to be infected, and thus more likely to be involved in a post-test programme.

Chart 7.56: Access to ARVs

Of those on ARVs, 47.6% of PLWA reported difficulties in accessing ARVs, while the majority (52.4%) indicated easier access, of which 38.1% reported access to be somewhat easy, and 14.3% stating access to be very easy. For those not on ARVs, lack of drugs and drugs not yet required were the reason given for non-usage. 90.5% of those on ARVs say they adhere to their prescription routine.

In terms of what is being done to assist PLWHA, respondents mentioned a number of interventions. These ranged from equipping health centres with ARVs, and assistance with compiling memory books and writing wills, to guidance, counselling, radio talk shows on stigma and community sensitisation.
The organisations implementing these interventions were reported as being majorly government and non-governmental organisations, health workers and employers.

However, respondents suggested some interventions ought to be strengthened or added. These included extension of drugs to health centres, supporting PLWHA with capital and income-generating activities, training in animal rearing and poultry keeping, community sensitisation for positive living, provision of food to improve on nutrition and encouraging men to go for tests.
Chapter 8:

Governance

Key findings

- There is an information gap between the population and local government and CSOs about development planning, implementation and budgets. Communication is best improved through local radio stations and LC1 offices.

- 53.9% of respondents found it difficult to directly access information about development programmes. 11.6% suggested they had no direct access to such information.

- Active community participation in various aspects of the planning and implementation of development interventions is a measure of effective governance. However, ignorance, lack of a sense of civic duty and impediments by leadership are the main factors contributing to weak community participation among district residents. This is especially true among poor and more deprived households, and among women and other vulnerable population groups.

- A total of 72.3% of households have attended meetings organised by the village LC1 leaders. More men than women attend these meetings, with only a small percentage participation of PWDs and other population groups. The majority of households in all LLGs, except Mpondwe Lhubiriha and Karambi attend village meetings, as do higher proportions of better-off households.

- District residents show a preference for government as the implementer of development programmes. However, the majority of households (62.9%) have never participated in the selection of government projects in their community, be it by government or CSOs. The proportion of those who have never participated in project selection is higher in the poor wealth groups.

- 82% of households believe the community plays an active role in reducing poverty; however, only 43.9% of households have contributed to a community project in their area.

- The majority of households have never participated in LLG planning and budgeting of public resources (69.7%). Women are particularly marginalised from the process with 96.7% of women suggest that they do not participate. By comparison only 60.0% of PWD do not participate and 65.0% of young people.

- The LLGs with the smallest concentration of households participating in the LLG plan and budget are Hima, Nyamwamba division, Kitholhu, Kyondo, Bulembia division, Mahango, Central division, Karambi, Kyarumba and Rukoki.

- The majority of households are not actively involved in the process of LLG planning and budgeting (61.7%). 26.1% are not at all involved, 9.1% are adequately involved while the remaining 3.0% are active in their participation. The main reasons for not being involved are lack of information about the process and lack of information about how to participate. Other reasons include lack of a sense of civic duty, lack of transparency by leaders and gender discrimination towards women’s involvement.

- The majority of households do not know whether their LLG plan and budget is pro-poor (52.3%). 38.8% of households do not consider their LLG plan and budget to be pro-poor while
only 8.9% believe it is. Pro-poor elements include NAADS and infrastructure development, whereas the main pro-poor element missing was the provision of low interest credit.

- Though structures and systems are in place to facilitate effective governance at local level, district residents lack confidence in their leaders both to utilise funds allocated to development effectively, and to be transparent and accountable in the use of such funds, weakening development efforts. The vast majority of households do not know how LLG funds allocated for development are spent (89.8%). In addition, 47.9% of households do not believe allocated funds are well spent, 13.4% do consider public funds to be utilised well, while 38.7% of respondents did not know whether funds were well spent.

Context

Studies suggest that governance and development are partners, with a shared goal of seeing the lives of citizens improved (Renno, 2010). Good governance has the potential to enrich the development process, while bad governance can thwart all the best efforts made to enhance people’s livelihoods and welfare.

Participation, by the populace, in a variety of poverty reducing activities is a key part of good governance, designed to guard against the potential for political elites to ignore or coerce citizens in pursuit of their own agendas.

With this in mind, this study particularly looked at the participation of district residents in a number of community and development activities.

This report explores the sources of information on government programmes and the ease with which this information is accessed. Furthermore, households’ involvement in community meetings, programmes and projects is examined, briefly looking at the effectiveness of household contributions to community projects.

Finally, given that previous district studies have highlighted poor community involvement in the development of the LLG plans and budgets, this aspect of governance is assessed. Various aspects the LLG plans and budgets are examined including who in the community participates in their development, the level of participation, whether the plans and budgets are considered pro-poor and lastly whether households are aware of how budget allocations are spent, and whether spending is considered effective.

Sources of information on government programmes

As shown in the graph below, the main source of information on government programmes is the local councils, followed by the radio, family members, friends or neighbours and NGOs or CBOs. The least popular source of information is the print media.
The graph below indicates the source of information on government programmes within wealth groups and household deprivations. It shows that local councils followed by the radio are the main sources of information on government programmes for all wealth groups. In fact, the largest percentage of households in all wealth groups, except the ‘wealthy’, receive information about government programmes from local councils. Those in ‘wealthy’ households, predominantly receive information via the radio. A similar pattern applies to household deprivations whereby most households with between one to five deprivations receive information on government programmes from the local councils, whereas those with no deprivations primarily use the radio as a source of information.

In terms of the distribution of households according to the main source of information on government projects, the graph below shows that households in different LLGs prefer different means of gaining information. A larger proportion of households in rural LLGs prefer local councils...
and the radio as the main source of information on government programmes, while households in urban LLGs have a greater diversity of sources.

Chart 8.3: Source of information on government programmes within LLGs

The majority of respondents found it difficult to directly access information about development programmes (53.9%). 11.6% of respondents suggested they had no direct access to such information.

Chart 8.4: Ease of direct access to information about development programmes

Participation in meetings, programmes and projects

As seen in the graph below, a total of 72.3% of households have attended meetings organised by the village LC1 leaders.
The graph below indicates attendance of LC1 meetings within wealth groups and household deprivations. It shows that within all wealth groups, the greater proportion of households attends local LC1 meetings. This proportion is slightly higher in the better-off wealth groups than in the poor ones. The pattern within household deprivations is less clear.

Attendance of LC1 meeting within the LLGs varies somewhat. The majority of households in all LLGs attend village meetings, with the exception of Mpondwe Lhubiriha and Karambi where the greater proportion of households do not attend LC1 meetings compared to those who do.
The study findings show that men more than the women attend village meetings, and that only small percentages of PWDs and others population groups attend.

District residents show a preference for government as the implementer of development programmes. 54.8% of households favour the implementation of development projects by government rather than CSOs. This is a departure from findings of a previous poverty perception survey conducted by the district which suggested the opposite (KDLG, 2009b).

In terms of participation in project selection, the greater percentage of households has not participated in any project selection, either by government or CSO. 62.9% of households state they have not participated in the selection of a government project while 67.4% of households indicate the same for CSO projects.
The greatest percentage of households within all wealth groups has never participated in the selection of government projects, as seen in the graph below. This proportion is higher in the poor wealth groups than in the better-off ones in both government and CSO project selection. This indicates that participation in project selection is generally very low and that participation by poor households is particularly depressed. Within household deprivations participation is equally low, though the differences between the groups are less pronounced.

Within LLGs participation in the selection of government projects varies significantly. A few LLGs have high proportions of household members participating in government project selection, while in most LLGs those who do not participate outrank those who do. For example, in Hima only 12.7% of households participate in selecting government projects compared to 87.3% who do not. On the
other hand, in Karusandara, 70.9% of households participate in such activities as opposed to 29.1% who do not.

Chart 8.11: Participation in government project selection within LLGs

However, as the graph below shows, where households have indicated that they participate in government project selection, certain LLGs fare better than others in terms of the participation of poor households. For example, in 15 of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Mahango to Katwe Kabatoro in the graph below) 50% or more of those who participate in government project selection are from poor households (predominantly ‘moderately poor’ and some ‘extremely poor’ households). By contrast, in 5 out of the 6 urban LLGs (all except Katwe Kabatoro) and in other better-off LLGs such as Kisinga, Bugoye, Maliba and Rukoki the proportion of poor households participating in government project selection is very low. This may be in part due to the higher proportion of better-off households in these LLGs, but may also reflect a non-proactive approach to the involvement of poor households in the process.

Chart 8.12: Participation in government project selection by poor households within LLGs
Similarly, in all but three LLGs, most households do not participate in CSO or development partner project selection. The exceptions are Karusandara, Kilembe and Lake Katwe where 50% or more of households report participating in CSO or development partner project selection.

As per the graph below, where participation in CSO or development partner project selection has occurred, in 16 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Mahango to Buhuhira below) 50% or more of household participation was among the poor wealth groups. Once again, in most of the urban LLGs and the better-off ones participation by poor households is very low. An exception is Central division where 76.9% of poor households report having participated in CSO or development partner project selection as opposed to only 22.4% of poor households who participated in government project selection.
82% of households agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the community can play an active role in reducing poverty in the parish, 14.8% disagreed while 3.2% were unsure. Despite this belief only 43.9% of households reported having contributed to a community project in their area.

Of those who did contribute, the majority suggested that the service delivered by the project was worth the contribution (61.1%).

As seen in the graph below, within wealth groups, the larger proportion of households has never contributed to a community project. However, ‘wealthy’ households have a slightly higher percentage of participation compared to ‘extremely poor’ households, where only 37.3% of households have ever contributed to a community project. The pattern is similar within household deprivations. Here too larger proportion of households has never contributed to a community project, and the proportion of these households increased with the addition of household deprivations.
Contribution to community projects varies within LLGs. Some, such as Nyamwamba, have much fewer households contributing compared to those who do not, while others, such as Lake Katwe, have much higher proportions of those who do contribute to community projects.

The graph below indicates the level of participation of poor households in community projects where participation has occurred. In 17 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Mahango to Katwe Kabatoro in the graph) 50% or more of the households participating in community projects are from the poor wealth groups. Once more, the remaining urban LLGs and the better-off LLGs, such as Kisinga, Maliba, Bugoye and Rukoki fail to get a large proportion of households from the poor wealth groups participating in community projects, favouring instead those from better-off wealth groups.
Participation in planning and budgeting

A total of 69.7% say they have never participated in planning and budgeting of public resources, as shown in the graph below.

96.7% of women interviewed suggest that they do not participate in the preparation of LLG development plans and budget. The reason given that prevent women from participating include lack of information about the plans and budget, lack of mobilisation of women on these issues, men’s exclusion of women, illiteracy and corruption of leaders.

Study findings suggest that PWDs are also politically marginalised, but less so that women. In fact, 60.0% of PWDs interviewed indicate they do not participate in the preparation of their LLG
development plans and budget. Poor leadership, neglect and lack of information are the main reasons which stop PWDs from participating.

Similarly, 65.0% of young people interviewed say they have no part in the preparation of LLG plans and budgets, due to lack of information and invitation by leaders.

As per the graph below, in all wealth groups the greater proportion of households does not participate in their LLG plan and budget. Non-participation by ‘extremely poor’ households is particularly pronounced with only 21.5% of households in this wealth group participating. Similarly, a high and relatively consistent percentage of households within each household deprivation do not participate in LLG plans and budgets.

**Chart 8.20: Participation in LLG planning and budgeting within wealth groups and household deprivations**

The pattern of participation in LLG planning and budgeting varies within LLGs. Some LLGs, such as Hima, Nyamwamba division and Kitholhu, have very high percentages of households who do not participate compared to those that do. In others, such as Karusandara and Kilembe, the proportion of those who do participate is higher than those who do not.
The map below shows the district concentration of households participating in LLG planning and budgeting. It indicates that Maliba, Munkunyu and Rukoki have the highest percentages of households involved in the development of LLG plans and budgets. On the other hand, Hima has by far the smallest percentage of households participating in the process.
However, though Maliba and Rukoki have high concentrations of households participating in LLG planning and budgeting, when examined in terms of wealth groups, results indicate that those participating are predominantly from the better-off wealth groups (‘self-sufficient’ and ‘wealthy’ households).

In fact, as the graph below shows, where participation in LLG planning and budgeting has occurred, involvement of poor households in LLG planning and budgeting is very poor in all urban LLGs, especially Mpondwe Lhubiria, all the divisions of the municipality, Hima plus in Kisinga, Bugoye, Rukoki and Maliba. As previously mentioned, this may be attributed in part to the higher proportion of better-off households in these LLGs, but may also reflect a failing to proactively target the participation of poor households.

On the other hand, in 15 out of the 28 LLGs (LLGs from Kitholhu to Kyabarungira in the graph) 50% or more of those who participate were households from the poor wealth groups.
Chart 8.22: Participation in LLG planning and budgeting by poor households within LLGs

The graph below indicates the level of participation of households in LLG planning and budgeting. It shows that a total of 61.7% of households indicate that they are not actively involved in the process of LLG planning and budgeting. Only 3.0% are actively or very actively involved, 9.1% are adequately involved, while the remaining 26.1% are not at all involved.

Chart 8.23: Level of participation in LLG planning and budgeting

The majority of households suggest that the reason they are not involved is because they are not informed about the process of LLG planning and budgeting or about how they can be involved in the process. Other reasons include lack of a sense of civic duty, fear by leaders that by involving the community they will be held accountable if they do not fulfil what is planned and budgeted for, and gender discrimination towards women’s involvement.
38.8% of respondents did not consider their LLG plan and budget to be pro-poor. The majority did not know whether the plan and budget considered the poor, while just 8.9% suggested it was pro-poor.

Chart 8.24: LLG plan and budget pro-poor

Of those who considered the plan and budget to be pro-poor, the elements that were appreciated as such were primarily the NAADS programme, particularly the provision of inputs, followed by the general development of infrastructure, most especially the extension of electricity and water, and the construction of culverts.

The elements that those who did not believe their LLG plan and budget to be pro-poor would have liked are shown in the graph below. By far the most mentioned pro-poor element was the provision of low interest credit. This was followed by the improvement of roads, the provision of clean and safe water and the improvement of drainage systems.

Chart 8.25: Pro-poor elements desired but deemed missing from LLG plan and budget
The chart below indicates that 89.8% of households do not know how LLG funds allocated for development are spent.

Not only are households not aware of how allocated development funds are spent, when asked to agreed or disagreed with the statement that public funds are well utilised, 47.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed, 38.7% were unable to provide an answer either way, while only 13.4% agreed or strongly agreed that public funds were utilised well.

Worryingly, this demonstrates that there is little transparency and accountability in terms of how allocated funds are spent, as well as low confidence in LLG officials’ ability to spend development funds effectively.

Government services not only need to be effective and efficient in service delivery, they also need to be seen to be participatory, effective and accountable. Unfortunately, this survey depicts a community that is sceptical about local government service delivery and detached from the
decision-making process. Women are identified as a disenfranchised group, together with most other vulnerable groups and the most poor.

Efforts should be directed at improving communication, particularly thorough the medium of radio, and at better involving all sections of the community in the decision-making process. Moreover, given that district and LLG plans and budgets are not viewed as being pro-poor and that utilisation of development funds by LLGs is either largely unknown or considered to be unsatisfactory, clearly targeting the needs of the poor, and improving transparency and accountability and clearly should be prioritised.
Chapter 9:

Recommendations

Overall recommendations

- **Land and demographic issues:** In view of the district's limited land and fast growing population, land and population growth are undoubtedly the most pressing challenges facing policy makers and planners in Kasese. Failure to tackle these issues will lead to increased land fragmentation and conflicts, further encroachment of protected areas and wetlands, increased food insecurity and a continuing rise in unemployment and underemployment. Ultimately, if these matters remain unaddressed any gains, so far made in the district's development, will be eroded and district poverty levels will run the risk of rising again.

Given the limitations and complexities of land and land use in the district, it is extremely important that the district manages existing land with increased care. As such, it is recommended that the services of land administration and adjudication be significantly strengthened, and that, if not already in place, viable strategies for land use management be developed. Failure to identify, and enforce, such strategies can further contribute to the existing conflicting uses of district land, with detrimental effects on tourism, the environment, and ultimately the livelihoods and well-being of district residents. Hand-in-hand with this recommendation, it is suggested that considerable efforts need to be made to improve land productivity and to encourage the sustainable utilisation of land resources (see below Agricultural development).

Furthermore, with the district's population doubling every twenty years, the sensitive issue of population can no longer be side-lined. The very high population growth rate of the district (one of the highest in the world) has widespread ramifications for every aspect of district development, and must not be seen as a stand-alone issue. As discussed below (see Infrastructure and public service development), the size and growth of the district's population, has extensive effects on all indicators of economic development and well-being. Therefore, it is recommended that the implementation of reproductive health and family planning programmes across the district be scaled up, with particular focus on young people. Given the high value placed on fertility among the district's population, the expansion of family planning programmes should be supported by an intensive strategy of sensitisation, addressing the extensive impacts of population growth on development, at household and district level. Moreover, to ensure the effectiveness of family planning programmes, it is essential that a coherent message on population issues be presented by all levels of the district administration.

- **Agricultural development:** Given that agriculture is the largest employer in the district, and that many of the district's poor households engage in crop farming, animal husbandry and capture fishing, the need to focus on developing the district's agricultural sector is self-evident.

It is recommended that significant efforts and resources be allocated to strengthening the capacity of households, particularly poor and more deprived ones, to increase productivity, through the use of improved agricultural practices and use of inputs, so as to enhance their earning capabilities and improve food security. In addition, promoting the sustainable utilisation of agricultural resources, through on-going sensitisation and enforcement of legislation is recommended. In effect, this means increasingly investing in extension services.
designed to educate households on appropriate and sustainable agricultural practices, and where necessary strengthening enforcement systems and structures. Emphasis should also be placed on post-harvest handling of agricultural products.

- **Economic opportunities and workforce development:** Economic development is linked to asset ownership and access to financial services. Not only do assets act as a buffer in times of difficulties, but productive assets help households generate new or expand existing economic activities. As such, acquiring assets, either through surplus incomes or through access to credit becomes an important household strategy for economic development. Given that poor and more deprived households have limited residual income, accessing affordable credit to purchase productive assets is essential. Therefore, it is recommended that the provision of affordable financial services, for the set up or strengthening of household economic activities, be expanded. Priority should be given to services tailored particularly to the needs of poor and more deprived households, and to the youth.

In addition, the key to a productive economy is a skilled and healthy workforce. That said, the district education and health sectors are facing serious challenges, and are currently struggling to meet the demands placed on them. Nevertheless, it is recommended that issues of quality, access and absenteeism be prioritised in both sectors. Furthermore, with regards to education, given the financial constraints of poor and more deprived households to afford university education and considering the stagnant job market, particularly for university graduates, it is suggested that greater investments be made in expanding high quality vocational training opportunities, especially for young people, thus creating a skilled labour force, able to command higher incomes.

- **Infrastructure and public service development:** With a fast growing district population, the need to continually build new infrastructure and extend public service delivery, to ensure adequate provision for the entire population becomes an imperative. At the current rate of population growth, infrastructure development and service provision need to double their capacity, every twenty years, just to provide the existing level of access and delivery. As such, if genuine impact is to be made on improving public infrastructure and services, considerable investments must be made in increasing the pace at which new infrastructure and services are rolled out. Naturally, the significant financial and human resource challenges that this poses to the district administration cannot be underestimated.

Given this, it is recommended that district policy makers and planners seek to raise additional funding, both locally and more widely, to manage the huge task ahead, and identify priority needs. Moreover, emphasis should be placed on priority infrastructure such as roads and bridges, electricity, vocational schools, health facilities, market infrastructure and water and sanitation. The community's role in maintaining and improving infrastructure must also be acknowledged. Efforts to motivate local communities to become more active and more readily willing to contribute to community projects need to be encouraged.

- **Attitudinal and behavioural issues:** Poverty is not simply an economic or physical issue, but also has to do with attitudes and behaviours. As such, approaches to reducing poverty should not merely focus on resolving the tangible aspects of poverty (e.g. low incomes, lack of food or poor housing), but also on transforming attitudes and mind-sets that perpetuate poverty.

This study has highlighted questionable attitudes, among district residents, toward the high fertility rate, education, women and work, all of which lead to behaviours that have detrimental effects on economic development and human welfare. In view of this, it is
recommended that considerable efforts be made not only to tackle the physical aspects of poverty, but also the attitudes and behaviours that constitute mental poverty.

- **Governance and leadership issues:** Across the district, mechanisms exist to encourage participation by community members in local governance issues. However, in view of poor community participation, it is recommended that greater efforts be made to ensure more meaningful participation and to foster a greater level of transparency in the process of LLG planning, budgeting and implementation, so that not only do district residents feel their concerns and input is considered, but also that funds allocated to development are well utilised. To achieve this, it is suggested that the radio be increasingly used as a means of passing on useful governance information to the populace, as well as strengthening Local Councils (LCs) to do so. Moreover, efforts to significantly improve the capacity of local government leaders to enable greater community participation should be made.

In addition, it is recommended that mechanisms for providing accountability to LLG residents be further strengthened. In this regard, the role of CBOs and NGOs should be acknowledged and fostered as providers of local checks and balances. Furthermore, it is suggested that during the planning and budgeting cycle, LLGs should specifically outline what their poverty reduction focus is.

- **Vulnerability issues:** The issues concerning vulnerable groups are many and varied. However, one of the main reasons these groups are vulnerable is due to the breakdown of family structures and the social norms and networks, traditionally known to protect and support in times of hardship. As such, it is recommended that family and social structures be strengthened. This can be achieved by encouraging the formation of formal and informal community groups like Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies, clubs and farmer groups.

Moreover, a further reason for increased vulnerability is that, due to their circumstances, these population groups have lower incomes and fewer opportunities to engage in productive activities. Therefore, it is recommended that further efforts to extend affordable financial services to vulnerable population groups be made. On the other hand, for those who are unable to engage in productive activities, especially the elderly and the chronically sick due to their physical weaknesses or children due to the fact that they should be in school, it is suggested that social security measures be developed to safeguard these vulnerable population groups from further slides into poverty.

Finally, it is paramount that vulnerable groups in the district should have equal access to public services and to development opportunities.

**Sector-specific recommendations**

It is acknowledged, particularly in the current climate, that the financial resources available for poverty reduction programmes are limited. However, despite these challenges, it is suggested that, wherever possible, interventions should seek to be innovative in their approach, and seek to tap resources beyond those that are immediately available. Boosting community participation and contribution, and the use of community resource persons, is strongly encouraged as a means of ownership and sustainability of development projects.

**Agriculture**

- **Increase productivity:** Given the limited land (both for crop farming and grazing) and the decreasing yields, improving productivity is essential if the poorest households are to sustain
themselves. Therefore, for crop farmers it is recommended that uptake of better farming practices, such as the use of agricultural inputs and better soil and water conservation by households, be strongly encouraged.

It is also strongly suggested that pastoral communities be encouraged to improve the productivity of their stock through the adoption of exotic and cross-breeds and modern livestock methods (e.g. artificial insemination). Since cost factors are often attributed to the failure to take up improved livestock rearing practices, it is also recommended that access to savings and credit groups be significantly improved in pastoral communities.

Enhancing disease and pest control is also advocated. Effective extension services are paramount to achieving this.

- **Strengthen the value chain:** Increasing the profitability of crops grown necessitates more effective marketing and/or value addition. As such, it is recommended that opportunities for marketing and adding value to specific crops be identified. To facilitate this, it is strongly suggested that the formation of organised farmers’ associations be encouraged. Not only will these benefit poor farmers strengthening every aspect of the value chain, they will also enable economies of scale and provide access to technical knowledge and agricultural credit.

- **Improve land management:** Effective land management can have a significant impact on the quality and availability of grazing land. As such, it is recommended that pastoral communities be strongly encouraged to take up good land management and conservation practices (e.g. leaving areas fallow for rejuvenation, weed removal). The adoption of these new practices can only be successfully achieved through continuing sensitisation and support from extension services.

- **Enhance law enforcement:** With declining fish stocks threatening the livelihoods of capture fishing communities, the preservation of the existing fish needs to be a priority. As such, every effort should be made to strengthen the enforcement of regulations governing capture fishing. Moreover, given that current law enforcement activities are largely perceived by the community as a threat to their livelihoods, it is strongly recommended that initiatives aimed at sensitising the community, as to the importance and purpose of regulations and their long-term benefits, be significantly increased.

- **Improve availability of fish resources:** Given the natural constraints on catches of wild fish, additional methods of ensuring the availability of fish resources should be considered. It is suggested that enterprises such as pond fish farming and cage farming be explored as possible alternative measures to control and improve the availability of fish stocks. Community sensitisation will need to will be required in order for such enterprises to be taken up and implemented.

- **Promote selective enterprises:** The extremely small size of land holdings owned by the poorest means that it is impossible for them to grow adequate food stuffs to support the needs of their family. This report has highlighted the difficulties of many poor households having meaningful secondary incomes to supplement what is produced agriculturally. As such, it is recommended that the poor, and those with under-sized plots, be encouraged to adopt new agricultural or non-farm enterprises which do not rely on large scale to produce income, but rather are higher value, less land intensive enterprises (e.g. poultry rearing, zero-grazing, fish farming, bee-keeping).

The same is true for fishing communities. Given the growing population within the fishing enclaves and the restricted livelihood possibilities within capture fishing, other alternatives will
need to be sought if the future prospects of fishing communities are to be improved. It is recommended, that alternative income opportunities, compatible with the location constraints of fishing villages, be investigate and encourage, particularly among the youth (e.g. poultry or community tourism).

To support these, access to savings and credit facilities will be of paramount importance. Focus should be given to improving access to pro-poor financial services particularly in LLGs where households have failed to obtain credit.

- **Strengthen and expand extension services**: The role of extension workers is critical to improving and developing the livelihoods of the district residents. The quality and dedicated follow up of extension services particularly to individuals and communities is essential to bringing about transformation of mind-sets and agricultural practices. Changing people’s attitudes is a long-term endeavour and requires consistent and continuous efforts.

Therefore, it is recommended that extension services be intensified, with emphasis not only on technical and physical support, but also on on-going sensitisation of the community on pertinent issues. It is additionally recommended that CSOs and development partners continue to work in close cooperation with government to deliver extension services in order to attain the greatest impact at the grassroots.

**Education**

- **Enhance access to and quality of education**: Education plays a central role in enhancing livelihoods and in giving life chances to the poor. Two components are needed to improve access to and the quality of education. The first is infrastructure (e.g. schools, desks and scholastic material); the second is the quality of the teachers, teaching methods and supervision. As additional funding to improve the infrastructure of schools is unlikely to be dramatically increased, it is suggested that focus be on ensuring quality of teaching, teaching methods, and supervision. Strengthening supervision, and empowering and motivating the teaching force should play a significant role in combating teacher absenteeism and encourage the teachers to strive to preform to maximum standards. This is especially true for rural and hard-to-reach mountainous areas. Moreover, as mentioned above, focussing on scaling-up vocational training opportunities, especially for young people, is essential if the large and growing young workforce is to be actively engaged in productive economic activities.

- **Improve attendance rates**: Poor attitudes towards education and cost factors are most often associated with absenteeism and poor school attendance. This limits the chances households have of improving their incomes opportunities, and poor households have to escape poverty. As such, it is recommended that significant efforts be made to sensitisre both parents and children to the importance of education, such that mind-sets are changed and education is valued, above cultural practices or the potential financial gains of withholding children from school, especially during peak seasons. This is particularly true for the education of the girl-child. It is suggested that such programmes should target poorer households, whose heads are themselves most likely to be poorly educated. Moreover, initiatives to strengthen household saving and income earning capabilities should be encouraged so as to better meet the financial responsibilities of education.

**Health**

- **Scale-up preventive healthcare**: Given the time and financial constraints of expanding healthcare to better reach the poor, the most immediate action, with possibly the most significant impact on the health and welfare of the poor households, is to prevent them from succumbing to ill-health. As such, it is recommended that the promotion of preventive
healthcare, most especially targeting sanitation and hygiene, family planning and maternal and child health, be scaled-up throughout the district, particularly in poorer communities and in those where households travel more than 5 kms to reach the nearest health facility.

- **Improve access to savings and credit groups:** Cost is often associated with limited uptake of health services, particularly among the poor. For poor households to effectively embrace preventive health, and be better prepared to meet unexpected medical costs, they must be encouraged to strengthen their financial positions. One means of achieving this is by strengthening their savings ability. It is suggested, therefore, that the establishment of savings and credit groups be significantly scaled-up across the district. Savings will act as a buffer against shocks, while access to credit will allow households either to purchase assets which can be liquidated in times of need or make productive investments which reap income rewards.

- **Improve nutrition:** This study has identified that poor nutrition is common throughout the district, but disproportionally affects the most poor. Poor nutrition affects not only productivity and development, but also the susceptibility to sickness, and can increase the duration of incapacity during sickness. As such, it is recommended that a multi-sectoral approach to improving dietary intake, especially among the poor, be implemented.

**Vulnerability groups**

- **Scale-up formation of organised community groups:** Organised community groups, in the form of PWD support groups, post-test clubs, youth groups or VSLAs, when managed well have proven to provide not only psychosocial support, but also access to other services, such as training opportunities and savings and credit services. Thus, it is recommended that among vulnerable groups the establishment and support of such groups be encouraged. Particularly for those vulnerable population groups able to engage in productive employment, it is strongly suggested that the focus be on expanding quality vocational training opportunities (most especially for the youth) and on encouraging savings as a way of coping with risk and accessing credit to start or expand productive enterprises.

- **Conduct further research:** This study has highlighted the limited available information about certain vulnerable groups, and initiatives aimed at supporting them. This is particularly the case for child-headed households, but also for other vulnerable groups such as the youth and the elderly. This report, therefore, advocates for further research to be conducted to gain a better understanding of these population groups and their particular challenges and vulnerabilities, so that initiatives can be efficiently targeted to assist them.

**Governance**

- **Strengthen communication:** Effective, two-way flow of information between community and government, CSOs and development partners is vital to successful planning and implementation of poverty reduction programmes. In conjunction with LC1s, radio has been identified as the most useful tool in disseminating information. As such, it is recommended that radio be increasingly utilised to inform households about development programmes, to encourage increased community participation, and as a tool for improving accountability with regards to the implementation of and allocation of funds to such programmes.

- **Improve pro-poor focus of LLG plans and budgets:** Given that the pro-poor elements of LLG plans and budgets is either not known or not felt by the community, it is recommended that efforts be improved and scaled-up to ensure that not only are pro-poor aspects included, but that they are effectively communicated to the wider community.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Research methodology

A comprehensive planning and inception process for the study was undertaken, a combined effort involving the district administration, the Uganda Bureau of Statistics and the external consultant engaged to conduct the study. A series of planning meetings and working seminars were used to train and mobilise internal district resource persons to take charge of the study and to participate in different preparatory processes. All project planning and inception activities were executed by the District Core Team (DCT), a structure that was constituted by the district administration to assist the District Planning Unit (DPU) in fostering project execution. The DCT included representatives from different district departments, as well as from NGOs working in the district (see Acknowledgements for full list).

Data collection for the PPM surveys was executed by specially recruited and trained enumerators and researchers under the supervision of cluster supervisors. Altogether, the district was subdivided into 9 clusters each comprising 3-4 lower local governments. Cluster supervisors were selected from the DCT. A total of 94 enumerators and seven special category researchers participate in the data collection exercise.

To meet the different objectives and purposes of the PPM study, a mix of random and subjective sampling criteria was adopted by the study team. This mix allowed the team to exercise strict scientific research standards while, at the same time, providing for subjective elements, an essential ingredient of the PPM design, in order to address the different socio-economic and geophysical characteristics of the study population and take care of the heterogeneity of the district. In setting the sampling frame for the PPM study, there was need to provide for statistical representation of the data up to the LLGs level, and to ensure a balance between demographic characteristics, social-economic and geophysical diversity of the district’s population.

Determination of the study sample was scientifically made. It utilised the following parameters and/or procedures:

- Total number of households in the district (projected to be 133,000 by 2010).
- Proportional distribution of households in LLGs in the district.
- Feasible/acceptable proportion of households to be targeted in the study.
- Determination of the total number of households in the study sample.
- Proportionate distribution of the total number of households in study sample study amongst LLGs in the district (using percentage share of each LLGs to district household numbers).
- Determination of the total number of villages to be targeted in each LLG.
- Determination of the approaches to be employed to select the four villages to be covered (using findings from the pre-study survey on the livelihood and physical characteristics of the district).
- Determination of number of households to be targeted in each of the study villages.
- Selection of particular households to participate in the study.

Quantitative and qualitative survey mechanisms were employed to generate the poverty related data gathered in this study. The mechanisms included the following:
Structured interviews using quantitative questionnaire conducted at the household level in selected communities.

Semi-structured interviews using structured qualitative questionnaires conducted at households for special categories of the population.

Focus group discussions based on structured conversation guides conducted with leaders and technical staff of lower local governments, and representative leaders from the community.

Focus group discussions based on structured conversation guides conducted with separate men's and women's groups of people from each of the special categories of the population. These included the elderly, young people, children heading households, women heading households, PWDs, PLWHA, subsistence cultivators, pastoralists, those involved in capture fishing and urban dwellers.

Key informants interviews conducted with national and district leaders and technical staff, as well as NGOs working in the area.

Review of secondary data and use of reports from national data files and studies recently conducted in the district.

A total of over 10,000 respondents were targeted by the PPM survey. These included 9275 households, 300 special category respondents, over 300 participants of LLG-based and special category-based focus group discussions (FGDs), in addition to other key informants.

Data entry and processing was executed by the statistics section (of the DPU) assisted by an external consultant, and a team of externally sourced data entry clerks. The data entry clerks were recruited mainly from the unemployed graduates from Kasese district, to fulfill the poverty alleviation strategy of the project. At this stage, different activities were carried out including: data cleaning and post-field coding, development of data entry screens, recruitment of data entry clerks, installation of SPSS and Stata programs to be used in data entry and analysis, training of data entry clerks, data entry, error verification, data security and, finally, data analysis. The data analysis packages used were Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) and Stata.

The last component of this study was mapping. This was done by an external consultant with the help of the Kasese District Planning Unit. The consultant undertook the following activities to execute the mapping exercise:

- Review of current and existing maps for Kasese district to establish if all the sub-counties under the study were included.
- Identification of key poverty indicators in the data that can adequately inform the poverty map production.
- Analysis of existing data provided by Kasese district to generate clear and accurate results to guide the mapping process. The following activities were undertaken: digitising of administrative boundaries, creating of attribute tables on the map, attaching of statistical information to the attribute table of the map, analysing the data on the map, flaming and making the different maps for each variable. The analysis was done using the ArcView programme.
- Production of Kasese district poverty maps considering all the different poverty indicators included in the data set.
Appendix 2: Wealth index

A composite wealth index was used to categorize households into the four main wealth groups: (1) 'extremely poor', (2) 'moderately poor', (3) 'self-sufficient' and (4) 'wealthy'. In total, 10 assets and basic needs were selected to make up the composite wealth index. These included four physical assets, four productive assets, one human asset and one basic need. Indicators were defined for each of the assets as per the table below.

Table 9.1: Composition of wealth index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Type of roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Number of bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ownership of mobile phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Ownership of radios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Value of land owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Ownership of cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership of goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>Ownership of small canoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership of large canoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership of fishing nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit access</td>
<td>Amount of credit accessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN</strong></td>
<td>Work status of household head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>Meals per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since poverty is largely perceived by households in physical terms as a lack of basic needs the use of a selection of indicators was deemed as an appropriate measure of poverty. The type of housing and one’s ability to improve it is a key factor characterising poverty and was thus included, alongside ownership of a number of other physical assets. Moreover, the work status of the household head, productive assets, and one’s access to them, are vital to sustaining and improving household incomes and livelihoods and thus were considered good measures of wealth or poverty. Finally, the number of meals per day consumed by the household was included as it represents the household’s ability to adequately satisfy basic consumption needs. The deprivation index (explained in more detail below) considers other basic needs such as education, clothing and sugar intake.

The categorisation of a household’s wealth group was based on the household’s ability to access and make use of the defined assets, and to satisfy the prescribed basic need. The more assets a household owns the better able to secure an regular income and cope when faced with challenges. The table below shows the definition of each indicator per wealth group.

Table 9.2: Wealth index indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>WEALTH GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL</strong></td>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing: Type of roof</td>
<td>Thatched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing: Type of walls</td>
<td>Mud and wattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Owns no bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSETS</td>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL</strong> (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Owns no mobile phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Owns no radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Owns land up to a value of UGX1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock: Cattle</td>
<td>Owns up to 10 cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock: Goats</td>
<td>Owns up to 5 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing: Small canoes</td>
<td>Owns no small canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing: Large canoes</td>
<td>Owns no large canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing: Nets</td>
<td>Owns no nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit access</td>
<td>Less than UGX100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td>Household head unemployed/subsistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption</td>
<td>Has one meal per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be classified in a particular wealth group, a household must comply with at least five of the indicators in that group.
Appendix 3: Deprivation index

The composite deprivation index constructed in this report is based on the UBOS deprivation index (UBOS, 2007). The index is based on a household’s ability to satisfy certain basic needs. These five basic needs include availability of soap for bathing, ownership of clothing and shoes, sugar intake and access to primary education.

Households were asked whether they always had soap to bathe, whether each household member had at least one pair of shoes and two sets of clothing, whether any household members had dropped out of school in the last six years and how many days per week members of the household partook of sugar.

For the first four variables, a negative answer would indicate the household’s inability to satisfy the basic need. For the last variable, an intake of sugar of less than 7 days a week signifies a household’s inability to provide the basic need on a daily basis, and thus indicates a deprivation.

The greater the number of deprivations recorded the lower the well-being of the household. A household unable to satisfy all five basic needs is considered extremely deprived, whereas a household with none or only one deprivation has a relatively high well-being level, and is likely to be much better off.
Appendix 4: Poverty reduction interventions

The table below outlines some of the more prominent development interventions operating in Kasese District.

**Table 9.3: Poverty reduction interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty reduction programme</th>
<th>Programme description</th>
<th>Programme implementer</th>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Amount given (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action for Community Development (ACODEV)</td>
<td>VAW prevention and response for family stability; Promotion of Human Rights Based Approach to Development-HRBA; Uganda Right to Food Campaign Project aimed at promoting the claim holders’ capacity capacities to demand accountability on one side and for duty bearers and on the other hand to fulfil the right to Food.</td>
<td>ACODEV; and working with district local governments and other small CBOs</td>
<td>HRBA 9 District Local Gov’ts; In Kasese working with 05 CBOs; and LLG structures in case of VAW prevention and response</td>
<td>2006-2012</td>
<td>KIOS Finland; (2006-2011) UNICEF for HRBAP 2010-2011</td>
<td>130,000 Euros in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Based Agricultural Modernization Programme (AAMP)</td>
<td>Focused on agricultural modernization and infrastructural development</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>All LLGs</td>
<td>1999-2006</td>
<td>GOU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukonzo Joint Credit and Saving Promotion</td>
<td>Bukonzo Joint-private</td>
<td>Bukonzo East Constituency</td>
<td>Share-holders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukonzo Mixed Farm Horticulture Commercial Farming</td>
<td>Bukonzo Mixed-private</td>
<td>Whole district</td>
<td>Share-holders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE International</td>
<td>Wetlands management</td>
<td>Natural Resources Department-KDLG</td>
<td>Wetland sites</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agricultural Infrastructure Program (CAIP)</td>
<td>Improvement of roads, markets and agro processing centres</td>
<td>MLG and KDLG</td>
<td>Kilembe, Nyakiyumb, Bwesumbu and Kyalumba</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>$5m for five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Driven Development Programme (CDD)</td>
<td>Income enhancement for groups</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>All LLGS</td>
<td>Since 2006</td>
<td>GOU</td>
<td>UGX110m per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion International (CI)</td>
<td>Agricultural training, domestic violence, disaster management, education, HIV/AIDS, Evangelism and discipline</td>
<td>South Rwenzori Diocese</td>
<td>Whole district</td>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>UGX 91m every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)</td>
<td>Marketing produce, value addition through construction of dryers, management of mango fruit fly and village savings and credit societies formed</td>
<td>FAO office</td>
<td>Kitswamba, Rukoki, Munkunyu and Bwer</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>UGX90m per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Focus Area</td>
<td>Key Areas</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasese Coffee Farmers’ Alliance Support Project</td>
<td>Farmer organisational development and capacity building, coffee production improvement, coffee quality improvement, processing and logistics, commercial empowerment and improving gender relations</td>
<td>Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, Bugoye, Maliba, Rukoki, Kyabarungira and Buhuhira</td>
<td>2012 - 2015</td>
<td>ICP and aBi Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasese District Community Support Programme</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral focussed on service delivery (infrastructure and income enhancement)</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>BTC UGX4bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasese District Poverty Reduction Programme KDPRP, Phase II</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral approach focussed on income enhancement through LED</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>BTC UGX4bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Management Service Delivery Programme (LGMSD)</td>
<td>Focused on health, education, roads, water, production and marketing</td>
<td>District LG and LLGs</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
<td>GOU UGX1bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luwero Rwenzori Development Programme (LRDP)</td>
<td>Focused on household income enhancement</td>
<td>District LG and LLGs</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
<td>GOU UGX200m for two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)</td>
<td>Promotion of improved agricultural technologies</td>
<td>District LG and LLGs</td>
<td>Phased since 2005, Started with 7 LLGs</td>
<td>GOU UGX2.5bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Good governance and downward accountability Emergency Response Planning</td>
<td>Oxfam and Local CBOs</td>
<td>Whole district</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Action Fund (PAF)</td>
<td>Focused in production and marketing and rural water works</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>Since 2003</td>
<td>GOU UGX1bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS)</td>
<td>Boreholes construction</td>
<td>Government of Uganda and URCS</td>
<td>Whole district</td>
<td>GOU and volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children in Uganda</td>
<td>Girl Child Education and support to school infrastructure</td>
<td>Save the Children and KDLG</td>
<td>Hard to reach sub counties</td>
<td>Save the Children Norway, UK, Sweden &amp; Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Capacity Building for LGs and CSOs</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Whole district</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Decentralisation for Sustainability (SDS)</td>
<td>Decentralisation</td>
<td>Health Department, KDLG</td>
<td>All health facilities</td>
<td>USAID UGX213m every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRIDES for Family Health</td>
<td>Family Planning, Child Survival and Maternal Health</td>
<td>STRIDES and KDLG</td>
<td>Kasase District LG</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Road Fund</td>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td>District and LLGs</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
<td>GOU UGX1bn per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Wildlife Authority</td>
<td>Revenue sharing for parishes bordering the park</td>
<td>Natural Resources Department, KDLG</td>
<td>Parishes neighbouring the parks</td>
<td>GOU UGX200m every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral approach</td>
<td>Districts/Entities</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>UGX Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicef</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral approach</td>
<td>District LG, LLGs and CSOs</td>
<td>All LLGs</td>
<td>1999-2010. Minimal support still in health &amp; water</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UGX300m for 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Watershed management, Renewable Energy access &amp; climate adaption</td>
<td>WWF, DLG, CSOs, Communities</td>
<td>Kasese District</td>
<td>2006-2014</td>
<td>Norway, UNDP, Sweden</td>
<td>UGX 400m per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KDPU, 2012