



UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

UGANDA NATIONAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY 2005/2006



REPORT ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC MODULE

Uganda Bureau of Statistics
P.O. Box 7186, Kampala
Tel: 041 320740, 0772 705127
Fax: 041 237 553
E-mail: ubos@ubos.org
Website: www.ubos.org

December 2006

PREFACE

The Uganda National Household Survey 2005/06 is the latest in a series of household surveys that started in 1988. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on Socio-economic characteristics at both household and community levels as well as information on agriculture. The main objective of the survey was to collect high quality data on population and Socio-economic characteristics of households for monitoring development performance. The UNHS 2005/06 comprised of five modules namely the Socio-economic, Agriculture, Community, Price and the Qualitative modules.

This report presents the major findings based on the Socio-economic module of the UNHS 2005/06. It shows the levels of different indicators and their respective trends over time. Indicators on population characteristics, education, health, household expenditure and poverty among others have been presented at national, regional and at rural-urban levels.

This time round, a qualitative study was conducted alongside the UNHS 2005/06 to complement the quantitative findings. The main objective of the qualitative module was to provide more in-depth understanding of the issues that were investigated in the quantitative module. Separate reports have been prepared for the qualitative and other modules. There is a lot of information that is not included in this report and yet important for policy formulation and overall planning. The Uganda Bureau of Statistics would like to encourage stakeholders to utilize the rich datasets that exists at the UBOS to do further analyze so as to better inform future policy debate.

We are grateful to the Government of Uganda, the World Bank and the UK Department for International Development for the financial assistance that enabled the survey to take place. We would also like to acknowledge the technical backstopping provided by the Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) during the data analysis phase. Our gratitude is extended to all the field staff who worked hard to successfully implement the survey and to the survey respondents who provided us the information on which this report is based. To the Local Governments, thank you for unreserved support during the data collection. We are greatly indebted to you all for the invaluable cooperation.

J.B. Male-Mukasa
Executive Director

December 2006

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CV	Coefficients of Variation
EA	Enumeration Area
EFMP	Economic and Financial Management Project
EPR	Employment to Population Ratio
EPRC	Economic Policy Research Center
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FHH	Female Headed Household
GoU	Government of Uganda
HIS	Integrated Household Survey
HSSP	Health Sector Strategic Plan
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPT	Intermittent Presumptive Treatment
ITNs	Insecticide Treated Mosquito Nets
LC	Local Council
LFPR	Labour Force Participation Rate
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MFIs	Micro Finance Institutions
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development
MHH	Male Headed Household
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MTCS	Medium Term Competitiveness Strategy
NER	Net Enrollment Ratio
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSDS	National Service Delivery Survey
NSPI	National Strategic Plan of Intervention for Orphans and other vulnerable children
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund Programme
OVCs	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PAP	Poverty Alleviation Project
PAPSCA	Programme for Alleviation of Poverty and Social Costs of Adjustment
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMA	Plan for Modernization of Agriculture
PMAU	Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit
PWDs	Persons With Disabilities
SDIP	Social Development Sector Strategic investment Plan
SE	Standard Error
SEP	Strategic Exports Programme

SRS	Simple Random Sampling
TFR	Total Fertility Rate
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UDHS	Uganda Demographic and Health Survey
UN	United Nations
UNHS	Uganda National Household Survey
UPE	Universal Primary Education
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Programme
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	I
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	XIII
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 OVERVIEW.....	1
1.1 SURVEY OBJECTIVES.....	1
1.2 SCOPE AND COVERAGE	2
1.3 SURVEY DESIGN	4
1.4 SURVEY ORGANIZATION.....	5
1.5 DATA MANAGEMENT AND PROCESSING.....	5
1.6 FUNDING	6
1.7 RELIABILITY OF ESTIMATES	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	7
2.0 INTRODUCTION	7
2.1 POPULATION.....	7
2.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	9
2.3 MIGRATION.....	11
2.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	13
CHAPTER THREE	14
EDUCATION	14
3.0 INTRODUCTION	14
3.1 LITERACY STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS.....	14
3.2 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT.....	16
3.3 TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT.....	18
3.4 PRIMARY SCHOOL NET ENROLLMENT RATIO (NER)	19
3.5 REASONS FOR NEVER ATTENDING SCHOOL	19
3.6 REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL	20
3.7 COSTS OF SCHOOLING.....	21
3.8 DISTANCE TRAVELED TO DAY PRIMARY SCHOOLS.....	22
3.9 PRIMARY SCHOOL COMPLETION	23
3.10 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	24
CHAPTER FOUR.....	25
LABOUR FORCE AND TIME USE	25
4.0 INTRODUCTION	25
4.1 THE SIZE OF THE LABOUR FORCE.....	25
4.2 EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF THE LABOUR FORCE	27
4.3 EMPLOYMENT TO POPULATION RATIO.....	28
4.4 STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT.....	28
4.5 INDUSTRY AND SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT.....	29
4.6 OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE	31
4.7 WAGES	31
4.8 TIME USE	34
4.9 UNEMPLOYMENT.....	39
4.10 UNDEREMPLOYMENT.....	39
4.11 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	41
CHAPTER FIVE	42

HEALTH	42
5.0 INTRODUCTION	42
5.1 PREVALENCE OF DISEASE	42
5.2 DAYS LOST DUE TO ILLNESS	45
5.3 MEDICAL ATTENTION SOUGHT	45
5.4 DISTANCE TO HEALTH FACILITY	46
5.5 REASONS FOR NOT CONSULTING	46
5.6 USAGE OF MOSQUITO NETS	47
5.7 ANTI-MALARIAL DRUGS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN	48
5.8 RIGHT DOSAGE FOR FANSIDAR	49
5.9 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	50
CHAPTER SIX	51
HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE AND POVERTY ESTIMATES	51
6.0 INTRODUCTION	51
6.1 METHODOLOGY	51
6.2 CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURES	54
6.3 POVERTY TREND ESTIMATES	59
6.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	70
CHAPTER SEVEN	72
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, LOANS AND CREDIT	72
7.0 INTRODUCTION	72
7.1 INCOME OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	72
7.2 HOUSEHOLD INCOME CLASSES	73
7.3 MAIN SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD EARNINGS	74
7.4 INCOME AND CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS	75
7.5 LOANS AND CREDIT	77
7.6 TRANSFER AND OTHER EARNINGS	83
7.7 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	85
CHAPTER EIGHT	87
WELFARE LEVELS	87
8.0 INTRODUCTION	87
8.1 POSSESSION OF TWO SETS OF CLOTHES BY HOUSEHOLD MEMBER(S)	87
8.2 HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AGED LESS THAN 18 HAVING OWN BLANKET	88
8.3 EVERY HOUSEHOLD MEMBER POSSESSING AT LEAST A PAIR OF SHOES	89
8.4 FEEDING HABITS	89
8.5 OWNERSHIP OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLD ASSETS	93
8.6 MEDIAN VALUE OF HOUSEHOLD ASSETS	95
8.7 PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNANCE	96
8.8 HOUSEHOLDS' ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AFFECTED BY THEFT OR VIOLENCE	97
8.9 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	98
CHAPTER NINE	99
HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS	99
9.0 INTRODUCTION	99
9.1 TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT	99
9.2 OCCUPANCY TENURE OF DWELLING UNIT	100
9.3 ROOMS USED FOR SLEEPING	101
9.4 CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FOR DWELLING UNITS	102
9.5 DOMESTIC ENERGY RESOURCES	103
9.6 TYPE OF TOILET FACILITY	105
9.7 SOURCE OF WATER FOR DRINKING	106
9.8 DISTANCE TO SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	107
9.9 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	108
CHAPTER TEN	109
GENDER AND SELECTED HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	109
10.0 INTRODUCTION	109
10.1 HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP	110
10.2 EDUCATION LEVEL OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	110
10.3 HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP BY MARITAL STATUS	111
10.4 CARE GIVING ROLES FOR ORPHANS	111
10.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF HEALTH PROVIDER	112
10.6 ACTIVITY STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	112
10.7 INDUSTRY OF EMPLOYMENT OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	113
10.8 MAIN OCCUPATIONS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	114
10.9 INCOME EARNED BY OCCUPATION	114
10.10 INCOME BY INDUSTRY GROUPING	115

10.11	TIME USE BY HOUSEHOLDS	115
10.13	WAGES/SALARIES	117
10.14	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	117
CHAPTER ELEVEN		118
CHARACTERISTICS OF VULNERABLE GROUPS		118
11.0	INTRODUCTION	118
11.1	HOUSEHOLD SHOCKS	118
11.2	CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED VULNERABLE GROUPS	123
11.3	OLDER PERSONS	128
11.4	WIDOWS	129
11.5	PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES	130
11.6	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	135
CHAPTER 12		137
COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS		137
12.0	INTRODUCTION	137
12.1	EDUCATION FACILITIES	137
12.2	HEALTH FACILITIES	139
12.3	AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORT FACILITIES	142
12.4	COMMUNICATION AND BANKING FACILITIES	143
12.5	COMMUNITY SERVICES AND OTHER AMENITIES	143
12.6	ACCESS TO MARKETS	146
12.7	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	147
LIST OF REFERENCES		148
APPENDIX I		150
APPENDIX II (A)		156
APPENDIX II (B)		164
APPENDIX III		165
QUESTIONNAIRE		170

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Population Size by Sex (Pop numbers in millions and %)	8
Table 2.2: Distribution of Population by Age Groups and Residence	8
Table 2.3: Distribution of Population by Residence (%).....	9
Table 2.4: Number of Households by Residence (%).....	9
Table 2.5: Average Household Size by Residence (%).....	10
Table 2.6: Distribution of Household Heads by Age group and Sex (%)	10
Table 2.7: Household Headship by Residence and Sex (%)	11
Table 2.8: Distribution of Household Composition by Residence (%).....	11
Table 2.9: Percentage Migration rates by Type, Age and Region_(10+ years)	12
Table 2.10: Major reasons for migration by Specific age and Region_since 2001	13
Table 3.1: Literacy Rates for the Population Aged 10 Years and Above	15
Table 3.2: Literacy Rates for the Population Aged 18 Years and Above	15
Table 3.3: Literacy Rates of the Population by Wealth Quintile (%)	16
Table 3.4: Educational Attainment of Population Aged 15 years and above (%).....	17
Table 3.5: Educational Attainment of the Persons aged 15 years and Above by Wealth Quintile (%)	17
Table 3.6: Total Primary School Enrollment ('000)	18
Table 3.7: Total Secondary and Post-secondary Enrollment ('000).....	18
Table 3.8: Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio.....	19
Table 3.9: Reasons for Never Attending School for Children aged 6-12 Years by Sex (%)	20
Table 3.10: Reason for Dropping Out of Primary School (%)	21
Table 3.11: Median Costs of Primary Schooling per Year ('000)	21
Table 3.12: Median Costs of Secondary Schooling per Year ('000)	22
Table 3.13: Distance Traveled to Day Primary School (%).....	23
Table 3.15: Primary School Completion 2000 – 2006 ('000 pupils).....	23
Table 4.1: Labour Participation Rate for Persons 14-64 years by Sex, Residence and Age Group (%) .	27
Table 4.2: Labour Participation Rate for Persons 14-64 years by Educational Levels (%).....	27
Table 4.3: Employment to Population Ratio for Persons 14-64 years	28
Table 4.4: Employment Status of Working Population 14-64 years (%).....	29
Table 4.5: Employment of Working Population 14-64 Years by Industry	31
Table 4.6: Distribution of Work Force by Occupation (%).....	31
Table 4.7: Median Monthly Nominal Wages for Wage Employees ('000).....	32

Table 4.8: Median Monthly Nominal Wages for Wage Employees by Occupation ('000).....	33
Table 4.9: Distribution of Wage Employment in Non-Agricultural Employment by Sex	34
Table 4.10: Average Time spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity per day (Hours)	36
Table 4.11: Average Time Spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity per day by Occupation	37
Table 4.12: Unemployment Rate by Sex and Residence (%).....	39
Table 4.13: Time-Related Underemployment for Persons 14-64 years by Selected Characteristics	40
Table 5.1: Distribution of Population that fell Sick by Selected Background Characteristics (%)	43
Table 5.2: Population by Type of Illness/Major Symptoms and Residence (%).....	44
Table 5.3: Population by Type of Illness, Region and Age Groups (%).....	44
Table 5.4: Population by Type of Illness and Number of Days Lost (%).....	45
Table 5.5: Population by Type of Medical Attention Sought and Residence (%).....	46
Table 5.6: Population by Distance to Health Facility (%)	46
Table 5.7: Population that Slept under a Mosquito Net (%).....	48
Table 5.8: Population of Pregnant Women that took Anti-Malaria Drugs.....	48
Table 5.9: Pregnant Women 15-49 years that took the Recommended Dose for SP/Fansidar	49
Table 6.1: Consumption Expenditure Per Household (1997/98=100)	54
Table 6.2: Consumption Expenditure per Capita, in Nominal Terms	55
Table 6.3: Mean Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (1997/98=100)	56
Table 6.4: Adjusted Comparison of Mean Consumption Per Capita.....	56
Table 6.5: National Accounts Estimates of Real Private Consumption Per Capita	57
Table 6.6: Mean Consumption Expenditure per Adult Equivalent.....	58
Table 6.7: Share of Household Expenditure by Item Groups (%)	59
Table 6.8: Regional Share of Expenditure, Urban and Rural, by Item Groups (%).....	60
Table 6.9: Poverty Statistics in the UNHS 2005/06.....	60
Table 6.10: (a) Poverty in the UNHS 2002/03.....	61
Table 6.10: (b) Poverty in the IHS, 1992/93.....	62
Table 6.11: T-test Statistics for Hypothesis of Equality of Poverty Statistics in 2002/03 and 2005/06	62
Table 6.12: Consumption per Adult Equivalent at Each Decile (1997/98=100)	66
Table 6.13: Gini Coefficients for Uganda	67
Table 6.14: Decomposition of Income Inequality (%).....	67
Table 6.15: Poverty by Sector of Household Head, 2005/06	68
Table 6.16: Poverty by Sector of Household Head, 2002/03	68
Table 6.17: Poverty by Employment Status of Household Head	69
Table 6.18: Poverty by Most Important Source of Income to Household	70

Table 7.1: Average Monthly per Household Income by Residence	73
Table 7.2: Percentage distribution of households by Income class and Residence (%).....	74
Table 7.3: Major Source of Household Earnings by Residence (%).....	74
Table 7.4: Major Source of Household Earnings by Regions (%).....	75
Table 7.5: Average Monthly Household Income by Residence and Selected Characteristics ('000)	77
Table 7.6: Households that applied for a Loan by Source, Residence (%).....	79
Table 7.7: Households that did not apply for a Loan by Residence and Reason	80
Table 7.8: Loan Applicants by Source of Loan and Selected Characteristics.....	81
Table 7.9: Loan Applicants by Purpose of Loan and Sex (%).....	82
Table 7.10: Loan Applicants by Type of Collateral and Source of Loan (%).....	82
Table 7.11: Loan Applicant by Source and Repayment Period (%).....	83
Table 7.12: Households that received a Remittance during the last 12 months by Residence (%).....	84
Table 7.13: Recipients by Purpose and Source of Remittances (%)	85
Table 8.1: Possession of at least Two Sets of Clothes by Residence (%).....	88
Table 8.2: Possession of Blanket by Household Member(s) Aged Under 18 (%).....	88
Table 8.3: Possession of at least a Pair of Shoes by Household Member(s) (%).....	89
Table 8.4: Distribution of Households that took One Meal a day (%)	90
Table 8.5: Breakfast for Children Aged Below 5 years by Residence.....	91
Table 8.6: Breakfast for Children Aged Below 5 years by Regions (%).....	92
Table 8.7: Distribution of Households by Action Taken when Salt Last run Out.....	93
Table 8.8: Distribution of Households by Possession of Selected Household Assets and Region (%).....	95
Table 8.9: Median Value of the Selected Household Assets by Region ('000).....	95
Table 8.10: Distribution of Households with a member(s) that Participated in Local Governance (%).....	96
Table 9.1: Distribution of Dwelling Types by Region (%)	100
Table 9.2: Tenure Status of Dwelling Units by Region (%).....	101
Table 9.3: Distribution of Households by Number of rooms used for Sleeping by Region (%).....	102
Table 9.4: Distribution of Households by Type of Construction Materials and Residence (%).....	103
Table 9.5: Distribution of Households by Cooking Fuel and Residence (%).....	104
Table 9.6: Distribution of Lighting Fuel by Residence and Region (%).....	105
Table 9.7: Distribution of Type of Cooking Technology by Region (%).....	105
Table 9.8: Distribution of Households by Type of Toilet Facilities, Residence and Region (%).....	106
Table 9.9: Distribution of Households Accessing Safe Water by Residence (%)	107
Table 9.10: Distance to Main Water Source by Region (%).....	108
Table 10.1: Distribution of Household Heads by Sex and Residence (%).....	110

Table 10.2: Distribution of Household Heads by Educational Level (%).....	111
Table 10.3: Distribution of Heads of Households by Sex and Marital Status.....	111
Table 10.4: Distribution of Orphans by Sex of Household Head (%).....	112
Table 10.6: Distribution of Household members by Activity status (%).....	113
Table 10.7 Distribution of Heads of Household by Industry (%)	113
Table 10.8: Distribution of Occupations by Sex of Household Head (%).....	114
Table 10.9 Median Income by Occupation and by Sex ('000)	115
Table 10.10 Median Income by Industry and Sex ('000).....	115
Table 10.11: Average weekly Number of Hours Spent on Different Activities	by Sex 116
Table 10.12: Distribution of Household Heads by Occupation (%).....	116
Table 10.13: Wages by Sex of Household Head and Residence ('000).....	117
Table 11.1: Distribution of Households that Experienced Shocks, in the last 5 Years by Residence.....	120
Table 11.2: Median Duration in Months of Most Serious Shock by Region (%)	121
Table 11.3: Type of Mitigation Measures for Major Households Shocks by Residence (%).....	122
Table 11.4: Distribution of Major Households Shocks related to Agriculture by Type of Mitigation	122
Table 11.5: Distribution of Children (0-17), by Parental Survival and Selected Characteristics (%).....	124
Table 11.6: Distribution Households with Orphans by Number of Orphans (%).....	125
Table 11.7: Distribution of Children, 0-17 by Orphanhood Status and Living Arrangements (%).....	126
Table 11.8: Characteristics of Working Children and Child Labourers (5-17) Years by Region (%).....	127
Table 11.9: Selected Characteristics of Older Persons (aged 60+) by Sex (%)	129
Table 11.10: Selected Characteristics of Widows (aged 15+) (%).....	130
Table 11.11 : Disability Rates by Sex and Broad Age (%).....	131
Table 11.12 : Distribution of Persons with Multiple Disabilities (%)	132
Table 11.13 Selected Characteristics of Persons with and without a Disability.....	133
Table 11.14: Rehabilitation of Persons with Disability (%).....	134
Table 11.15 : Distribution of Persons with Disabilities aged 6-24 years by Ability to attend School	135
Table 12.1: Availability of Education Facilities by Residence (%).....	138
Table 12.2: Availability of Education Facilities by Region (%)	138
Table 12.3: Distance to Nearest School Facility from the Centre of LC1 by Residence (Km)	139
Table 12.4: Availability of Health Facilities by Residence (%)	139
Table 12.5: Distance to Health Facility by Region (Km).....	140
Table 12.6: Availability of Condoms and Other Family Planning Methods by Residence (%).....	142
Table 12.7: Transport Facilities by Region (%).....	142
Table 12.8: Communication and Banking Facilities by Region (%)	143

Table 12.9: Distribution of Markets in Communities by Region (%).....	146
Table A 1: (a) Poverty in the UNHS 2005/06 (excludes Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese	150
Table A1: (b) Poverty in the UNHS 2002/03, 2002/03 (excludes Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese	150
Table A1: (c) Poverty in the UNHS 1999/00, 1999/00 (excluding Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese	151
Table A1 (d): Poverty in the IHS, 1992/93 (excluding Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese	151
Table A 2: Statistical Tests on Poverty Headcount Index	152
Table A 3: Comparison of Poverty Estimates	153
Table A 4: Welfare Indicators by Wealth quintile	154
Table A 5: Characteristics of all Vulnerable Children by Background Characteristics	155

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1: Average Time spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity Per day by Sex (Hours)	35
Figure 4.2: Average Time Spent (Hours) on Economic and Care Labour Activity per day by Age	37
Figure 4.3: Time-Related Underemployment for Persons 14-64 years by Age Group (%).....	41
Figure 5.1: Major Reasons for not Seeking Medical Attention (%)	47
Figure 6.1: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Uganda	64
Figure 6.2: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Rural	65
Figure 6.3: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Urban	65
Figure 7.1: Loan Applicants by Residence and Region (%).....	78
Figure 8.1: Distribution of Households Affected by Theft or Violence (%).....	97
Figure 9.1: Distribution of Dwelling Types (%)	100
Figure 9.2 Distribution of Tenure Status (%).....	101
Figure 10.1: Distribution of Treatment Source by Type of illness and Sex of Household Head (%).....	112
Figure 11.1: Households that experienced at least one Shock in the Last 5 Years (%)	119
Figure 11.2: Orphanhood Rates in Uganda (%).....	123
Figure 11.3: Vulnerable Children by Region (%).....	128
Figure 11.4: Disability Rates by Age group and Sex (%)	131
Figure 12.1: Mode of Transport to the Nearest Government Health Unit	141
Figure 12.2: Communities reporting the most common Source of Medicine	141
Figure 12.3: Distribution of Communities with Access to Safe Drinking Water by Residence (%)	144
Figure 12.4: Distribution of Communities that reported having Electricity Services (%)	145
Figure 12.5: Distribution of Major problems reported by Communities (%)	146

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The demand for and use of data for evidence-based policy and decision making has extended beyond the confines of administrative boundaries to cover household activities and behavior. Monitoring changes at household level through household surveys has, therefore, become more important now than ever before. The Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) has been carrying out an integrated household survey, popularly known as Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) every other year since the late 1980s. Through the UNHS, Uganda has very rich household time series data covering over 13 years. The data have been the main source of statistical information for monitoring poverty levels, trends and related welfare issues. The UNHS 2005/06 was undertaken from May 2005 to April 2006 and covered about 7,400 households scientifically selected countrywide. The survey was comprehensive and had five modules, namely; Socio-economic, Agriculture, Community, Market and Qualitative modules.

The estimated population of Uganda in 2005/06 was 27.2 million with females constituting 51 percent of the total population. The population of Uganda was dominated by persons below 15 years. Since 1999/00, the number of households has been rising. From 4.2 million in 1999/00 they increased to 5.2 million in 2005/06. The Eastern region had the largest average household size of 5.6 compared to Central region with 4.8. The survey showed that the youth (18-30 years) migrated more than any other group of the population.

Net enrollment levels were reported to be about 84 percent during the last 5 years. Overall, literacy rates are still low at 69 percent despite the existence of UPE. Many of the children in school going age failed to attend school at all because they were considered 'too young'. Other barriers like cost of education (uniform, scholastic materials, etc) are limiting universal access to primary education. Up to 20 percent of the population 15 years and above had no formal education.

The labour force grew at an annual rate of 3.6 percent with workers in rural areas accounting for most of the growth. Three quarters of the labour force had lower than secondary level education and were mainly employed in the agricultural sector though the earnings from it were five times less than the earnings in the public sector.

Disease prevalence in Uganda increased from 29 percent to 40 percent between 2002/03 and 2005/06. Malaria was reported to be the dominant cause of sickness accounting for about 50 percent of the sicknesses reported. Majority of the people

who fell sick sought medical attention from private clinics. Among those who fell sick but sought no medical care, illness being mild was the major reason. Other reasons were cost and long distances to the health facilities. Although the use of mosquito nets has increased from 11 percent in 2002/03 to 17 percent in 2006, malaria still poses a major challenge to health service delivery in Uganda.

There was strong growth in per household and per capita expenditure especially in rural areas. The proportion of people living in poverty declined from 39 percent in 2002/03 to 31 percent in 2005/06. In absolute terms, 8.4 million Ugandans lived in poverty in 2005/06. The reduction in poverty was particularly marked for some sub-groups of the population. Rural areas experienced strong growth in mean consumption levels, while the urban areas experienced a reduction in inequality of income.

About half of the households mainly got their earnings from subsistence farming. Only one in every ten households applied for credit. Fewer households in the rural areas applied for credit from formal and semi-formal sources than in urban areas. The proportion of recipients of remittances from local sources was much higher than that from abroad.

Overall, 9 percent of the households took one meal a day. However, children aged less than 5 years took nothing for breakfast in 10 percent of the households. Out of the total number of households, 39 percent owned a bicycle which serves as a means of transport. Fifteen percent of the households in Uganda had at least one of its member(s) operating a savings account with a formal institution. Nine in every 10 people had at least two sets of clothes and one in every two household members had at least a pair of shoes. The ownership of clothes and shoes did not register significant changes between 2002/03 and 2005/06.

More than half of the households lived in detached dwellings while one in every five households lived in huts. Over three quarters of households were found in owner-occupied dwelling units whereas a quarter stayed in rented dwelling units. Almost two thirds of dwellings had iron sheets as roofing material, one half were constructed with brick walls and over three quarters had earth floors. Two in every three households had access to safe drinking water in 2005/06 and this is similar to the 2002/03 finding. One in every ten households had no toilet facility, a slight improvement from 13 percent registered in 2002/03. Generally, the housing and sanitation indicators did not change significantly between 2002/03 and 2005/06.

One in every four households was headed by a female. Females spent more time in care labour than males and this was true in all regions. Care labour in this case

refers to activities like looking after children and the sick, collecting firewood, fetching water and cooking.

The survey results show that nearly two thirds of all households experienced at least one type of shock. The main shocks were drought, floods, death of family members, pest attacks, robbery and civil strife. Rural households suffered mostly from shocks related to agriculture. The median duration of the most serious shock was 4 months and use of savings ranked highest as a mitigation measure. Vulnerable persons comprise of orphans, widows, older persons (60+) and People With Disabilities (PWDs). Fifteen percent of children below 18 years were orphans while 18 percent of those aged 5-17 were engaged in child labour activities. The national disability rate was 7 percent, of which 20 percent had multiple disabilities. Over 40 percent of PWDs aged 6-24 attending school declared that they were affected all the time. For those PWDs aged 14-64, 46 percent declared that they were affected with regard to participating in employment activities

Across all communities, the availability of education and health facilities, electricity services and access to safe drinking water increased since 2001. The nearest Government Primary school was found within an average distance of 2 km while the nearest Government Hospital was on average 27km away and walking was the most common means of reaching these facilities.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Overview

The demand for evidence based decision making has reached unprecedented levels today more than ever before. The level of data usage has extended not only to cover basic administrative data but also to include more detailed household level information. Household surveys therefore, have become an invaluable source of information for monitoring outcome and impact indicators of national and international development frameworks.

As a key contributor to the monitoring framework, Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) has conducted large-scale surveys since 1989. The surveys have had a nationwide coverage with varying core modules and objectives. The 2005/06 round of household surveys was yet another in a series conducted by UBOS. The last household survey was conducted in 2002/03 with a focus on labourforce and informal sector in addition to the standard Socio-economic module. This time round, the survey carries an agriculture module in addition to the Socio-economic module. The surveys primarily collect socio-economic data required for measurement of human development and monitoring social goals with special reference to the measurement of poverty under the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

1.1 Survey Objectives

The main objective of the survey was to collect high quality and timely data on demographic, social and economic characteristics of the household population for national and international development frameworks.

Specifically, the objectives were to:

1. Provide information on the selected economic characteristics of the population including their economic activity status among others.
2. Design and conduct a country-wide agricultural survey through the household approach and to prepare and provide estimates of area and production of major crops and other characteristics at national and regional levels.

3. Meet special data needs of users for the Ministries of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Health, Education and Sports among others, and other collaborating Institutions like Economic Policy Research Centre, together with donors and the NGO community so as to monitor the progress of their activities and interventions.
4. Generate and build social and economic indicators and monitor the progress made towards social and economic development goals of the country; and
5. Consolidate efforts being made in building a permanent national household survey capability at UBOS.

1.2 Scope and Coverage

The UNHS 2005/06 covered all the districts in Uganda. Efforts were made to ensure that all clusters in each district were canvassed. Five modules were administered. These included Agriculture as the core module, Socio-economic, Community, Price, Crop cards and Qualitative modules. The details of each of the modules are summarized below:

1. The Agricultural module covered the household crop farming enterprise particulars with emphasis on land, crop area, inputs, outputs and other allied characteristics. The purpose of this module was to give a better descriptive picture of Uganda's farm economy, and deeper insight into factors affecting farm incomes. These would provide a better understanding of the influence of farmers' resources and marketing opportunities on farm-household income among other characteristics. The components included; investments on land, crop areas, labour and non labour inputs for both the first and second seasons, crop disposition, land rights, disputes and certificates, livestock ownership, small animals and poultry, expenditure on livestock and agricultural extension services and technologies. In addition, a crop card was developed and administered to all sampled households with an agricultural activity. Estimation of production from own-produce is a major challenge to agricultural statisticians. It is even more challenging for the frequently harvested crops like cassava, sweet potatoes and matooke. Respondents were requested to record all harvests from own produce. The cards were distributed to respondents during the first visit and retrieved at the second visit to the household. The duration between the first and second visit was about five months.

2. The Socio-economic module covered household characteristics including education and literacy, the overall health status, health seeking behavior of household members, malaria, fever and disability, activity status of household members, wage employment, enterprise activities, transfers and household incomes, housing conditions assets, loans, household expenditure, welfare indicators and household shocks.
3. The Community Survey questionnaire collected information about the community (LC1). The information related to community access to facilities, community services and other amenities, economic infrastructure, agriculture and markets, education and health infrastructure and agricultural technologies.
4. The Price module was undertaken to provide standard equivalents of non standard units through weighing items sold in markets. This entailed visiting all the markets in the sampled Enumeration Areas (EAs) and weighing the various items being sold. In cases where there was no market/ trading centre, the market frequented most by the residents of the sampled EA would be visited and measurements taken. The Price module was used to collect the different local prices and the non standard units which in many cases are used in selling various items. These varied across regions and in some cases across districts. These were then measured and an equivalent in standard units recorded.
5. The Qualitative Module was developed to complement the quantitative data from household surveys. UBOS in collaboration with Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit (PMAU) and Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Programme (UPPAP) undertook a qualitative study as part of the UNHS 2005/06. The objectives of the Qualitative module were to:
 - Improve the analysis and interpretation of the findings
 - Collect information that could be used to explain the changes in poverty levels as measured by quantitative findings
 - Link measurement of poverty with qualitative assessments of poverty.
 - Improve the measurement of impact of policy interventions

- Validate, complement and explain the findings of the quantitative study.

Both the Quantitative and Qualitative study findings will complement each other. The findings of the Qualitative Module will be disseminated in a separate volume as part of the UNHS 2005/06 series and will further explain the findings from the quantitative study. This complementarity will be strengthened in future household surveys under the long term survey program.

1.3 Survey Design

A two stage sampling design was used to draw the sample. At the first stage, Enumeration Areas (EAs) were drawn with Probability Proportional to Size (PPS), and at the second stage, households which are the Ultimate Sampling Units, were drawn using Simple Random Sampling (SRS).

The sample of EAs for the UNHS 2005/06 was selected using the Uganda Population and Housing Census Frame for 2002. Initially, a total of 600 Enumeration Areas (EAs) was selected. These EAs were allocated to each region on the basis of the population size of the region. However, in the Northern region, the number of EAs drawn was doubled. The extra EAs were to be held in reserve to allow for EA attrition due to insecurity.

After this sample was drawn, it was realized that the sample size in 10 districts needed to be increased to about 30 EAs in each district to have an adequate sample size for separate analysis. These extra EAs were selected using an inter-penetrating sampling method which led to drawing an extra 153 EAs. Moreover, because a considerable proportion of the population in the North was in Internally Displaced People (IDPs) camps, this was treated as a separate selection stratum and an additional sample of 30 EAs was drawn from the IDPs. Thus, a total of 783 EAs representing both the general household population and displaced population was selected for the UNHS 2005/06.

1.3.1 Sample Size

The size required for the sample was determined by taking into consideration several factors, the three most important being: the degree of precision (reliability) desired for the survey estimates, the cost and operational limitations, and the efficiency of the design. The UNHS 2005/06 covered a sample size of about 7,400 households.

1.4 Survey Organization

A centralized approach to data collection was used and comprised of 15 field teams. Each team consisted of one Supervisor, one Editor, 4 Enumerators and one Driver. Fieldwork was undertaken with the use of mobile field teams whereby work was programmed from the headquarters to all the sampled areas. There are four statistical regions, and the teams were recruited based on the languages mostly used in each region. In total, there were 15 Supervisors, 15 Editors, 60 Enumerators, 4 Regional Supervisors, 4 Senior Supervisors and 15 Drivers.

1.4.1 Number of Household visits

Two visits were made to each household in order to capture seasonality patterns in both agriculture and household consumption modules. In total, 10 households were targeted per EA with two visits per household. The visits were as follows:

- The first visit (May-October 2005)

The Agricultural module was administered to all households that were engaged in agricultural activities to collect information for the first crop season. In addition, the Socio-economic module was administered to five out of the ten selected households in each Enumeration Area (EA).

- Second visit (November 2005-April 2006)

The agricultural module was administered to all households that were engaged in agriculture to collect information for the second crop season. The Socio-economic module was then administered to the remaining five out of the ten selected households in each EA.

1.5 Data Management and Processing

To ensure good quality of data, a system of double entry was used. A manual system of editing questionnaires was set-up in June 2005 and two office editors were recruited to further assess the consistency of the data collected. A computer program (hot-deck scrutiny) for verification and validation was developed and operated during data processing.

Range and consistency checks were included in the data-entry program. More intensive and thorough checks were carried out using MS-ACCESS by the processing team.

1.6 Funding

The Government of Uganda and the World Bank through the second phase of the Economic and Financial Management Project (EFMP II), and the Department For International Development (DFID) provided the financial

support that enabled the survey to be undertaken. This was part of the six year programme that has enabled UBOS to undertake two household surveys.

1.7 Reliability of Estimates

The estimates presented in this report were derived from a scientifically selected sample and analysis of survey data was undertaken at National, regional and rural-urban levels. However, separate analysis has been presented for Kampala district because of its effect on the indicators in the Central region. Thus, where Kampala exists, the Central region excludes it, otherwise it includes it. It would also be possible to have precise estimates for the districts of Apac, Arua, Bushenyi, Mbarara, Mbale, Iganga, Kamuli, Mubende, Masaka and Mukono which were over sampled. Sampling Errors (SE) and Coefficients of Variations (CVs) of some of the variables have been presented in Appendix III to show the precision levels.

CHAPTER TWO

CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

2.0 Introduction

Since 1948, population censuses in Uganda have remained the main source of data on socio-demographic characteristics of the population. Other sources available for Socio-economic data at national level in the country include Demographic and Health Surveys (UDHS), National Household surveys (UNHS) and National Service Delivery Survey (NSDS).

The importance of population data, of recent, has been much emphasized in development planning¹ leading to inter-censal surveys to supplement and update population census data². Since the last census of 2002, a National Service Delivery Survey, 2004, and Uganda National Household Survey of 2005/06 have been conducted to provide estimates on various household characteristics.

The Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) 2005/06 collected information on personal characteristics of household members including information on age, sex, relationship to the household head and migration among others. In presenting demographic characteristics of the population, trends have been included where possible for comparison with previous surveys.

2.1 Population

The population of Uganda has been increasing in the three consecutive surveys as shown in Table 2.1 below. The UNHS 2005/06 estimated the Ugandan population at 27.2 million which compares with October 2005 population projections. The estimates further showed a higher percentage of the female population (51%) as compared to male population (49%). The sex ratio between 2002/03 and 2005/06 remained almost the same.

**Total population of
Uganda was estimated
at 27.2 million in
2005/06**

¹ ICPD International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), Cairo, 1994

² Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), Uganda, 2004

Table 2.1: Population Size by Sex (Pop numbers in millions and %)

Sex	1999/00		2002/03		2005/06	
	Pop	%	Pop	%	Pop	%
Male	10.5	49.2	12.3	48.4	13.2	48.7
Female	10.9	50.8	13.0	51.6	14.0	51.3
Both Sexes	21.4	100.0	25.3	100.0	27.2	100.0
Sex Ratio	-	96.2	-	94.6	-	95.1

Slightly more than half of the population is below 15 years

Table 2.2 shows that more than half of the population of Uganda (51%) is below 15 years of age. The percentage was higher in rural areas (52%) than in urban areas (44%). The working population 15-64 years was 46 percent which is not different from the UNHS 2002/03 survey findings. The results reveal a higher dependency ratio in rural areas(123) as compared to urban areas (85) with a slight improvement in the overall dependency ratio from 120 (UNHS 2002/03) to 116 (UNHS 2005/06).

Table 2.2: Distribution of Population by Age Groups and Residence

Age group	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural/Urban		Uganda	Rural/Urban		Uganda
	Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban	
0-14	53.8	43.2	52.2	52.0	43.8	50.7
15-64	43.9	55.5	45.5	44.8	54.2	46.2
65+	2.3	1.3	2.3	3.2	2.0	3.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Dependency ratio*	128	80	120	123	85	116

*The age dependency ratio represents the ratio of the combined child population (0-14) and aged population (65+) to the population of intermediate age (15-64).

2.1.1 Population Distribution

The urban population is steadily increasing

The trend of Uganda's population by residence and region since 1999/00 is shown in Table 2.3 below. The proportion of people in the rural areas has been decreasing since 1999 compared to the ones in the urban areas which has been steadily increasing. In addition, regional variations show that there are almost no changes in the population distribution for the stated period.

Table 2.3: Distribution of Population by Residence (%)

Residence	1999/00	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban			
Rural	87.0	86.0	84.6
Urban	13.0	14.0	15.4
Region			
Central	28.9	29.6	29.2
Eastern	26.6	27.4	25.2
Northern	19.1	18.3	19.7
Western	25.4	24.7	25.9
Uganda	100.0	100.0	100.0

2.2 Household Characteristics

2.2.1 Number of Households

The number of households increased

A household is defined as a group of people who normally live and eat together. As expected of a fast growing population, Table 2.4 shows that the number of households increased from 4.2 million in 1999/00 to 5.2 million in 2005/06. The findings are consistent with the 2002 population census results. The data also shows a slight increase in the proportions of households in the urban areas in the three subsequent surveys.

Table 2.4: Number of Households by Residence (%)

Residence	1999/00		2002/03		2005/06	
	Number (Millions)	%	Number (Millions)	%	Number (Millions)	%
Rural	3.5	84	4.1	83	4.3	82.6
Urban	0.7	16	0.8	17	0.9	17.4
Uganda	4.2	100.0	4.9	100.0	5.2	100.0

2.2.2 Average Household Size

Eastern region had the largest household size of 5.6

The average household size has been estimated at 5.2 in the UNHS 2005/06. This has persistently remained the same in the three surveys as shown in Table 2.5 below. Throughout the three surveys the household size was larger in rural than in urban areas. The Central region including Kampala has on average been with consistently smaller household sizes as compared to other regions.

Table 2.5: Average Household Size by Residence (%)

Residence	1999/00	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban			
Rural	5.4	5.3	5.3
Urban	4.4	4.1	4.6
Region			
Central	4.8	4.8	4.8
Eastern	5.3	5.5	5.6
Northern	5.3	5.1	5.2
Western	5.7	5.2	5.3
Uganda	5.2	5.1	5.2

2.2.3 Characteristics of the Household Head

The household head was defined as the member under whose guidance the major decisions of the household were undertaken. Sub grouping by specific age groups, in Table 2.6, shows that more than half of the household heads fell in age group 26-49 years and the percentage of males is higher than for females in this same age group. However a persistently higher variation in household headship between male and female was observed in 50 and above age group, where the majority of household heads are females.

Table 2.6: Distribution of Household Heads by Age group and Sex (%)

Age group	2002/03			2005/06		
	Male	Female	Uganda	Male	Female	Uganda
Below 18	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.3
18-25	16.3	12.7	15.4	13.1	9.2	12.0
26-49	62.9	59.3	61.9	62.6	50.3	59.3
50+	20.5	27.5	22.3	24.0	40.0	28.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In Table 2.7, it shows that over the three consecutive surveys slightly more than 70 percent of household heads were male. The Western and Eastern regions showed the lowest percentages of households headed by females in all the three surveys.

Majority of household heads are males

Table 2.7: Household Headship by Residence and Sex (%)

Residence	Household Head					
	1999		2002/03		2005/06	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Rural	73.6	31.1	76.0	24.0	73.6	26.4
Urban	68.9	27.1	64.1	35.9	70.7	29.3
Region						
Central	70.7	29.3	70.9	29.1	70.7	29.3
Eastern	75.8	24.2	77.3	22.7	75.9	24.1
Northern	65.4	34.6	68.6	31.4	69.2	30.8
Western	78.4	21.6	78.3	21.7	76.5	23.5
Uganda	72.9	26.4	73.9	26.1	73.1	26.9

2.2.4 Relationship to Household Head

Information on relationship of household members to their head was collected during the survey. The results in Table 2.8 show that overall, biological children of the household head constituted about half of the household population, which is consistent with the results of UNHS 2002/03. Children in rural areas were more likely to live with their biological parents than those in the urban areas. On the other hand there was an increase of 4.4 percentage points in the proportion of other relatives in the household between the two surveys and the increase was more in rural than urban areas.

Children in urban areas less likely to stay with their biological parents

Table 2.8: Distribution of Household Composition by Residence (%)

Relationship	2002/03			2005/06		
	Residence					
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Head	18.8	24.3	19.5	18.8	21.9	19.3
Spouse	13.4	12.2	13.3	12.7	12.1	12.6
Son/Daughter	53.2	42.2	51.7	49.9	44.4	48.8
Other relative	13.8	18.3	14.4	18.2	22.4	18.8
Non-relative	0.8	3.0	1.1	0.5	1.2	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

2.3 Migration

Migration is the movement of people across a geographically specified boundary for resettlement purposes. It is among the three factors responsible for changes in population size, the others being birth and death rates. Unlike birth rate and death rate, migration is not a biological event

and it is influenced by demographic, social, cultural, economic and political factors. The UNHS 2005/06 is the first among the many nationwide household surveys in the country which has directly captured population migration data at individual level. The information was collected from all members of the household aged 10 years and above. A question was asked whether one lived in another place, such as another village, town, district or country, for six or more months at any one time in the last 5 years.

The youth constituted 28% of migrants in Uganda

Table 2.9 indicates that a higher percentage of females (21%) compared to males (17%) migrated from one district to another. The results show that the international migration rate for both sexes was quite negligible. Inter-district and International migration jointly examined under specific ages revealed that the youth registered the largest percentage migrants (29%) as compared to other age categories. They were followed by the young adults and working population with 22 percent and 21 percent respectively. It is worth noting that migration by specific age portrays that the young and working population migrated more than the children or the older persons. Regional variations show that the Northern region had the highest proportion of individuals migrating with 36 percent as compared to the other regions.

Table 2.9: Percentage Migration rates by Type, Age and Region (10+ years)

Migration type	Male	Female	Uganda
Inter-district*	16.8	21.4	19.2
International*	0.3	0.2	0.2
Specific age groups			
10-17 (Children)	15.3	18.2	16.7
10-24 (Young adults)	17.2	25.6	21.5
18-30 (Youth)	22.8	33.9	28.9
15-64 (Working population)	18.7	23.6	21.2
60+ (Older persons)	7.2	11.7	9.6
Region			
Central	18.8	24.8	21.9
Eastern	9.6	15.9	12.8
Northern	33.8	37.1	35.5
Western	11.5	13.2	12.4
Uganda	21.9	17.3	19.7

*Inter-district: any person whose place of origin was outside the district of enumeration. This excludes persons who migrated from abroad.

*International: any person whose place of origin was outside the country.

Information was collected on reasons leading to migration. Looking for work and income was the major reason for migrating (28%) followed by insecurity (26%), marriage and joining family (15%). Migration due to insecurity was

reported by 66 percent of the population in Northern Uganda. The high percentage of migration due to insecurity in the Northern region can be attributed to the insurgency which has persisted in the area for some time. Other reasons such as drought, eviction, illness/injury, disability, divorce etc were reported by relatively less respondents and were therefore lumped together. The youth and working population migrated more than other age groups for the reason of looking for work and income (32%).

Table 2.10: Major reasons for migration by Specific age and Region since 2001

Specific Age	Major Reasons						Total
	Look for work & Income	Marriage	Insecurity	Join family	Education	Others	
10-17	17.0	3.3	30.7	23.1	19.3	6.7	100.0
10-24	21.5	19.0	22.4	17.4	14.0	5.7	100.0
18-30	31.8	27.5	16.9	11.7	6.5	5.6	100.0
15-64	31.6	18.7	23.2	12.5	6.9	7.3	100.0
60+	18.0	2.1	56.6	9.0	0.0	14.3	100.0
Region							
Central	43.8	15.1	1.5	19.8	12.3	7.6	100.0
Eastern	27.1	28.1	6.9	14.8	15.0	8.1	100.0
Northern	9.2	9.1	66.3	9.0	3.2	3.2	100.0
Western	39.7	17.8	3.8	15.2	8.6	14.9	100.0
Uganda	28.3	15.3	25.8	14.5	8.9	7.3	100.0

2.4 Summary of Findings

The findings showed that the estimated population of Uganda was 27.2 million in 2005/06 of which females were slightly more than males. The population below 15 years accounted for 51 percent of the total population. The number of households had increased in all the surveys since 1999/00. The average household size in Uganda was 5.2. The Eastern region had the largest average household size (5.6) as opposed to Central with the lowest (4.8). The survey showed that the youth migrated more than any other age group of the population.

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATION

3.0 Introduction

Education has been identified as a key component of human capital quality that is essential for higher incomes and sustainable economic growth. It is also recognized as an essential ingredient in poverty eradication. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) recognizes the critical role education plays in strengthening civil institutions, building a democratic society, empowering women and protecting the environment³. This chapter highlights the major findings from the data collected on education in the UNHS 2005/06.

Since the establishment of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997, enrollment in primary schools has drastically risen from around 3 million pupils in 1997 to about 7.5 million in 2003 and over 7.6 million in 2005/06.

3.1 Literacy Status of Household Members

One of the outcomes of basic education is literacy (i.e. the ability to read with understanding and write meaningfully in any language). In the survey, respondents were asked about their literacy status. Those who had completed primary seven and above were assumed to be literate.

Overall, 69 percent of the population reported to be literate. This shows a slight drop from the proportion reported in 2002/03. As indicated in Table 3.1, it can be seen that there are still gender variations in the literacy rates, with female literacy estimated at 63 percent compared to the male literacy rate of 76 percent. The rural-urban breakdown also shows considerable differentials, with a higher rate in the urban areas (86%) than in rural areas (66%).

Literacy among men is significantly higher than that among women

³ The Poverty Eradication Action Plan 2004/5 – 2007/08, MoFPED, December 2004

Table 3.1: Literacy Rates for the Population Aged 10 Years and Above

Residence	1999/00			2002/03			2005/06		
	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
Rural/Urban									
Urban	92	82	86	90	84	87	89	83	86
Rural	72	54	62	74	60	67	74	58	66
Region									
Kampala	-	-	-	94	91	92	92	90	91
Central	81	74	77	82	74	79	78	82	80
Eastern	72	52	62	72	54	63	56	71	64
Northern	64	33	47	72	42	56	45	74	59
Western	74	61	67	79	69	74	60	74	67
Uganda	74	57	65	77	63	70	76	63	69

It can be noted that Kampala stands out with the highest literacy rates. The Central region has higher literacy rates than the other regions; the Northern region has the lowest rates. This has been the reported trend over the years.

Adult Literacy Rate is estimated at 69 percent

The literacy rate for adults (persons aged 18 years and above) is estimated to be 69 percent, consistent with the national figure of the population aged 10 years and above. The variations between regions and gender also follow the trend for the population aged 10 years and above. Table 3.2 below shows that across regions as well as in rural and urban areas, the male literacy rate was higher than that of females. The Northern region still shows the lowest rate of adult literacy. Comparison with data from previous surveys indicates a similar trend.

Table 3.2: Literacy Rates for the Population Aged 18 Years and Above

Residence	1999/00			2002/03			2005/06		
	Male	Female	Ugand a	Male	Female	Ugand a	Male	Female	Ugand a
Rural/Urban									
Urban	93	82	87	91	84	87	91	81	86
Rural	75	47	59	77	54	65	78	53	65
Region									
Kampala	-	-	-	94	93	93	92	90	91
Central	84	71	77	86	79	82	85	75	80
Eastern	74	45	59	74	47	60	74	50	61
Northern	71	27	46	78	42	58	82	40	59
Western	76	55	65	79	64	71	78	54	66

Uganda	77	51	63	80	59	69	58	80	69
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Richer households more likely to have literate members

Information collected on household consumption expenditure was used to sub-divide all the households into wealth quintiles. This section, attempts to relate household wealth and the literacy status of household members. The findings indicate that persons 10 years and above in the highest wealth quintile were more likely to be literate (85%) compared to those in the lowest quintile (45%) as shown in Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Literacy Rates of the Population by Wealth Quintile (%)

Quintile	Population 10 years+		Population 18 years+	
	Illiterate	Literate	Illiterate	Literate
Lowest Quintile	55.0	45.0	56.5	43.5
Second Quintile	43.1	56.9	43.2	56.8
Middle Quintile	35.7	64.3	35.3	64.7
Fourth Quintile	26.5	73.5	25.0	75.0
Highest Quintile	15.2	84.8	14.4	85.6
Uganda	30.8	69.2	31.5	68.5

20% of the population had no formal education

3.2 Educational Attainment

Information about education attainment of persons aged 5 years and above was collected. However, analysis in this section considered persons 15 years and above because at 15 years, one is expected to have at least completed primary education. Findings indicate that overall, 20 percent of the population aged 15 years and above had never had any formal education. Table 3.4 shows that 43 percent had attained some primary education, but not completed primary seven. The proportion of people without any formal education was higher in the rural areas (23%) than in urban areas (9%). The proportion of females who had never had formal education was higher (28%) than that of males (11%). The Table also shows that urban residents were more likely to complete post-secondary education (10%) than their rural counterparts (2%). Kampala stands out with the highest proportion of people who had completed post secondary education (12%).

Table 3.4: Educational Attainment of Population Aged 15 years and above (%)

Background Characteristic	No formal schooling	Some Primary	Completed P.7	Some Secondary	Completed S6	Post secondary	Total
Sex							
Male	10.5	44.4	16.7	22.0	1.7	4.7	100.0
Female	28.3	42.3	11.9	14.7	0.5	2.2	100.0
Rural/Urban							
Urban	8.6	29.6	15.3	33.7	3.2	9.7	100.0
Rural	22.5	46.0	13.9	14.9	0.6	2.1	100.0
Region							
Kampala	4.3	27.7	13.9	37.8	4.6	11.6	100.0
Central	12.9	42.8	15.8	23.6	1.3	3.6	100.0
Eastern	20.3	46.1	13.6	17.0	0.6	2.5	100.0
Northern	26.7	46.7	11.9	12.2	0.6	1.8	100.0
Western	25.7	42.7	14.8	13.2	0.6	3.0	100.0
Uganda	20.1	43.3	14.1	18.1	1.1	3.4	100.0

3.2.1 Education Attainment by Wealth Quintile

The findings as shown in Table 3.5, indicate that a considerable proportion (35%) of household members in the lowest wealth quintile had no formal education. It also shows that 43 percent of persons in the highest income quintile had attained secondary education and above, compared to less than 10 percent of those in the lowest quintile. According to the UNHS qualitative module, not only does welfare influence the education attainment of individuals, but also the attitudes of parents towards education. Generally, the proportion of household members without any formal education decreases as one moves up the wealth quintiles.

Table 3.5: Educational Attainment of the Persons aged 15 years and Above by Wealth Quintile (%)

Quintile	No formal schooling	Some Primary	Completed Primary 7	Some Secondary	Completed S6	More than Secondary	Total
Lowest Quintile	34.9	48.4	8.9	7.3	0.2	0.4	100.0
Second Quintile	23.5	52.5	12.8	10.2	0.3	0.7	100.0
Middle Quintile	21.1	46.1	15.9	15.1	0.5	1.3	100.0
Fourth Quintile	15.7	43.3	16.1	20.8	1.4	2.9	100.0

35% of persons in the lowest quintile had no formal education

Highest Quintile	11.6	30.8	15.2	30.7	2.3	9.5	100.0
------------------	------	------	------	------	-----	-----	--------------

3.3 Total Primary School Enrollment

There has been an increase in the number of children enrolled in primary schools. Table 3.6 shows that the total number of pupils enrolled in primary schools in 2005/06 was estimated at 7.6 million reflecting a slight increase from the 2002/03 estimates. The survey estimates are higher than those estimates given by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES).

Table 3.6: Total Primary School Enrollment ('000)

Survey Year	Male	Female	Uganda	MOES Estimate Census
1999/00	3,554	3,162	6,716	6,591
2002/03	3,745	3,794	7,538	7,400
2005/06	3,892	3,739	7,629	-

3.3.1 Secondary School Enrollment

Total enrollment in secondary schools was estimated at slightly over 900,000 students. This estimate is higher than the projected figure from the Ministry of Education and Sports of about 770,000⁴. Findings in Table 3.7 indicate that enrollment was higher for males than females. The biggest concentration of students was in the lower grades, and tended to reduce as the grades increase. This decrease could be attributed to drop outs mainly due to high costs of education, among other reasons.

Table 3.7: Total Secondary and Post-secondary Enrollment ('000)

Secondary Attendance	Male	Female	Uganda
Attending Senior 1	105	107	212
Attending Senior 2	108	107	215
Attending Senior 3	107	95	202
Attending Senior 4	92	67	159
Attending Senior 5	28	19	47
Attending Senior 6	43	26	69
Total Secondary	483	421	904
Post Secondary attendance			
Post sec. training/Diploma	17	20	37
Attending Degree and above	32	22	54
Total Post-secondary	49	42	91

⁴ PEAP 2004, page 158

Primary school Net Enrollment Ratio has not changed

3.4 Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio (NER)

Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio (NER) is the ratio of pupils of the official primary school age range (6 - 12 years in Uganda) attending primary school, to the total number of children in the same age range in the population. Access to primary education is partly measured by the NER, and is one of the key indicators selected for the Poverty Eradication Action Plan. Table 3.8 shows that the Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio has basically remained unchanged for the last 5 years. The Millennium Development Goal (MDG)⁵ on Education is to achieve 100 percent enrollment of children 6–12 years by 2015. Past studies⁶ have also shown that a sizeable number of children outside the official school age range do attend primary school and this tends to lower the NER.

Table 3.8: Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio

Survey Year	Male	Female	Uganda
1999/00	85	84	84
2001 UDES*	87	87	87
2002/03	85	86	86
2005/06	84	85	84

*UDES- Uganda Ed-data Survey

Majority of children aged 6-12 did not attend school because they are considered too young

3.5 Reasons for Never Attending School

Persons aged 6-12 years, who reported that they had never attended school were asked the reason why. It can be seen from Table 3.9 that more than half of the children who never attended school were considered “too young” to attend school. This partly explains why, net enrollment in primary school is still less than 100 percent (as shown in Table 3.8). Other strong reasons why children never attended school include cost of education, need to help at home and indifference to education. These findings are consistent with information from earlier surveys⁷. The findings from the qualitative module indicate that apart from economic barriers, there were educational systems, social and cultural, political and physical barriers that prevented children from attending school.

⁵ Millennium Development Goals Country Report, Uganda, 2003 - page 11

⁶ See for example, the Uganda National Household Survey Report, 2003, Page 16

⁷ The 2002/03 UNHS had 53% of those who never attended as being too young. UNHS 1999/00 estimated it at 59%.

Table 3.9: Reasons for Never Attending School for Children aged 6-12 Years by Sex (%)

Reason for Never Attending	2005/06		Uganda
	Male	Female	
Too expensive	8.5	7.4	7.9
Child considered too young	54.2	52.2	53.2
School too far away	5.6	8.2	6.8
Had to help at home/family/business	8.3	11.2	9.6
Indifference to education	9.5	8.7	9.0
Orphaned	0.7	0.4	0.6
Disabled	6.6	5.6	6.1
Other reasons	6.6	6.3	6.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Other reasons include: Insecurity, displaced, etc

Schooling costs were the major cause of school dropout

3.6 Reasons for Dropping Out of School

In spite of global efforts to ensure that by 2015, all children, boys and girls should be able to complete a course of primary schooling⁸, and in spite of Government's introduction of free primary education, pupils still drop out before completing.

The survey findings in Table 3.10 indicate that the highest percentage of children who dropped out of school did so because it was too expensive for them (40%). Although UPE is supposed to be free, it is known that there are other costs related to school attendance like uniforms, stationery, transport, boarding fees, etc, which may be prohibitive to the households. Indifference to education (which includes parents' not favoring education and pupils not willing to attend further) is also a major reason why children are likely to drop out of school. These findings are confirmed by results from the qualitative module which indicate peer pressure (especially boys) and lack of parental support as some of the reasons causing school drop-outs.

⁸ The UN Millennium Declaration, 2000

Table 3.10: Reason for Dropping Out of Primary School (%)

Reason for Dropping out of School	2005/06		
	Male	Female	Uganda
Too expensive	35.0	42.6	39.5
Completed desired level	4.1	1.3	2.5
Had to help at home	0.7	7.3	4.5
Indifference to education	30.7	14.6	21.3
Poor academic progress	2.0	4.4	3.4
Sickness or Calamity	13.8	12.7	13.2
Other reasons	13.7	17.1	15.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Other reasons include: poor quality school, too far away, further schooling not available, and pregnancy

3.7 Costs of Schooling

The survey findings indicate that even with Universal Primary Education in place, one is required to pay some additional costs of schooling. Information in Table 3.11 shows that, a pupil in a day primary school is required to pay around 21,000 shillings per year. The median amount paid varies by school management. Privately managed day schools charge higher (64,000/=) than Government managed schools (19,000/=). For boarding primary schools, the median annual expenses amount to around 450,000 shillings. As expected, the private schools charge far higher than Government schools. School dues (School and registration fees mainly) constitute the largest proportion of these expenses in both cases.

Table 3.11: Median Costs of Primary Schooling per Year ('000)

Cost Description	Day Primary School			Uganda
	Gov't	Private	NGO	
School & Reg. Fees	7.0	45.0	9.0	9.0
Uniform & Sports Clothes	5.0	7.5	4.5	5.0
Books and Supplies	3.6	5.0	3.0	3.6
Boarding fees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Expenses	3.0	6.0	4.0	3.3
Uganda	18.6	63.5	20.5	20.9

Cost Description	Boarding Primary School			Uganda
	Gov't	Private	NGO	
School & Reg. Fees	240.0	270.0	60.0	247.0
Uniform & Sports Clothes	10.0	15.0	15.0	10.0
Books and Supplies	10.8	15.0	7.0	12.0
Boarding fees	170.0	150.0	100.0	150.0
Other Expenses	20.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
Uganda	450.8	480.0	212.0	449.0

Even with UPE,
there are still other
costs of schooling

The findings also indicate that the annual cost of schooling for day private secondary schools was slightly lower than that of Government and NGO schools. For boarding secondary schools, the school dues (school and registration fees) paid in private schools were higher (400,000) than that in Government and NGO schools.

Table 3.12: Median Costs of Secondary Schooling per Year ('000)

Cost Description	Day Secondary School			Uganda
	Gov't	Private	NGO	
School & Reg. Fees	150.0	135.0	180.0	143.0
Uniform & Sports Clothes	15.0	16.0	18.0	15.0
Books and Supplies	16.0	18.0	18.0	18.0
Boarding fees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Expenses	20.0	21.0	0.0	20.0
Uganda	201.0	190.0	216.0	196.0

Cost Description	Boarding Secondary School			Uganda
	Gov't	Private	NGO	
School & Reg. Fees	390.0	400.0	322.0	390.0
Uniform & Sports Clothes	25.0	20.0	20.0	22.0
Books and Supplies	30.0	34.0	30.0	30.0
Boarding fees	285.0	255.0	300.0	270.0
Other Expenses	60.0	50.0	100.0	55.0
Uganda	790.0	759.0	772.0	767.0

3.8 Distance Traveled to Day Primary Schools

Traveling long distances to a day school can have a bearing on children's retention in school. Information about distance to school was collected from all children who were attending school at the time of the interview. Only children attending day schools were interviewed. Information given in Table 3.13 shows that overall, the highest percentage (44%) of pupils attended schools within a distance of less than 3 kilometers. Around 35 percent of the children attended schools located less than a Kilometer from where they were staying. Kampala showed the largest proportion of children traveling longer distances of over 5 kilometers than all other regions. Almost 90 percent of the children in the Northern region traveled less than 3 kilometers to attend a day primary school.

Pupils travel less than two kilometers for primary schooling

Table 3.13: Distance Traveled to Day Primary School (%)

Residence	Distance Traveled			
	Less than 1 km	Btn 1 – 3 km	Btn 3 – 5 km	Above 5 km
Rural/Urban				
Urban	47.9	38.4	9.0	4.7
Rural	32.8	44.3	17.5	5.4
Region				
Kampala	50.9	30.0	10.7	8.4
Central	35.4	37.2	21.0	6.4
Eastern	32.3	48.7	14.6	4.4
Northern	41.1	47.8	8.9	2.2
Western	29.8	43.0	20.2	7.1
Uganda	34.7	43.6	16.4	5.3

3.9 Primary School Completion

In order to achieve the MDG target of having all children completing a course of Primary schooling, there is need to ensure that children who join Primary 1 are retained in school until they complete Primary 7. In this section, an attempt has been made to estimate the number of children who may have had continuous primary education from Primary 1 to Primary 7. Using the number of pupils enrolled in primary 1 in 2000 and comparing them with those enrolled in Primary 7 in 2006, the indication is that one in every three children who started Primary 1 in 2000 was likely not to complete Primary 7. Figures in Table 3.15 show that overall; about 1.8 million pupils were enrolled in Primary 1 in 2000. Assuming that the same group of people continued their schooling uninterrupted, the same number should ideally be attending Primary 7 in 2006. However, only 685,000 pupils were estimated to have been attending Primary 7 in 2006, meaning that the rest dropped out of school along the way or repeated at least one grade.

Table 3.15: Primary School Completion 2000 – 2006 ('000 pupils)

Currently Attending	Attending P.1 in 2000			Attending P.7 in 2006		
	Male	Female	Uganda	Male	Female	Uganda
Kampala	53	39	92	16	15	31
Central	251	226	477	80	85	165
Eastern	177	187	364	94	74	168
Northern	176	203	379	90	47	137
Western	251	244	496	98	86	184
Uganda	900	907	1,807	378	307	685

3.10 Summary of Findings

Education has been recognized as one of the key components of poverty eradication. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan in Uganda set priorities aimed at improving the sector. For example, one of the priority areas is to increase the transition from primary level to senior one from the current 50 percent to 80 percent by 2015⁹.

Literacy rates were still low despite the existence of UPE for almost ten years. There were still gender disparities in literacy with the males having a higher rate than females. Comparisons among different wealth groupings indicated that the richer people were more likely to be literate than the poor.

Findings from the UNHS 2005/06 indicate that net enrollment levels had stagnated for the last 15 years, and it is doubtful whether the MDG target of achieving 100% enrollment of 6 –12 year old children into primary school by 2015 can be realized. However this is partly caused by the fact that some children enroll late for primary school while others continue to attend primary school after the official age of 12 years.

The majority of children of school going age who failed to attend school at all did so because they were considered 'too young'. However a considerable proportion who did not attend gave a reason of indifference to education (either by parents/guardians or by the children themselves) while others gave a reason of staying back to help at home or farm.

In spite of the Universal Primary education, many children still dropped out of primary schools due to various reasons. Notable among these reasons was the cost of education, although a considerable percentage dropped out because of indifference/not willing to attend further.

The primary school retention and completion rates seemed to be very low. Findings indicated that almost two thirds of pupils who enrolled in primary one are unlikely to complete primary seven.

⁹ PEAP 2004, page 154

CHAPTER FOUR

LABOUR FORCE AND TIME USE

4.0 Introduction

The Government of Uganda developed the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) with the overall objective of reducing extreme poverty to less than 10 percent by the year 2017. The extent and magnitude of the employment problem has long been recognized as a serious issue in the country's efforts to reduce poverty.

The Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) 2005/06 provides estimates of employment, under-employment and unemployment which are important measures of the performance of the Ugandan labour market. In addition, information is used to produce other standard labour market indicators such as the annual labour force growth rate, employment rate, the participation rate and the proportion of women in non-agriculture wage employment. The UNHS 2005/06 also provides employment estimates by industry, occupation, public and private sector, hours worked and much more, all cross-classifiable by a variety of demographic characteristics.

Individuals are almost always engaged in some form of employment. The poor are always employed in marginal activities – poorly paid and poorly recorded. In this context, a rise in measured labour force participation is likely to be pro-poor to the extent that it is associated with a transition of marginally employed workers into more intensive or higher-paying employment.

4.1 The Size of the Labour Force

Labour force refers to economically active population and in the UNHS 2005/06 these were people aged 14-64 years, who were either employed or unemployed during the last seven days prior to the survey. Table 4.1 shows the size of the labour force, Labour Force Participation Rate¹⁰ (LFPR) and annual labour force growth rate as related to sex, residence and region. The labour force increased from 9.8 million in 2002/03 to 10.9 million

The current Annual Labour Force growth rate is 3.6%

¹⁰ Employment measures the number of people who work for an hour or more a week for pay or profit, or who work unpaid in a family business or farm. Labour force participation covers not only those people in employment, but also those who are unemployed and are actively seeking and available for paid work

persons in 2005/06 representing an annual labour force growth rate of 3.6 percent.

This is slightly above the national population growth rate of 3.2 percent per year. The Table further shows that the gap between the proportions for males and females in the labour force declined, leading to a higher annual labour force growth rate for males (4.4%) which is one and half times that for females (2.9%). The findings also show an increase in the LFPR of both males and females during the same period.

85 percent of the labour force was in rural areas

The distribution of the labour force by residence did not change between the two surveys with the labour force remaining principally rural (85%). There was no notable difference between the rural and urban growth rate of the labour force (4.2% and 3.2%) respectively.

A regional dimension in the annual labour force growth rate shows that Kampala recorded a decline of 0.9 percent. Western region had the highest growth rate of the labour force of 6.9 percent compared to its population growth rate of 2.8 percent. Kampala district and Northern region registered a decrease in the participation rate while other regions recorded an increase in the participation rate. The distribution of the labour force by region indicated that the highest share (30%) of the labour force is in Central region including Kampala, followed by Western, Eastern and Northern region respectively.

The Table further shows that the Labour force participation rate for Youth (International definition, 15-24 years) rose from 65.9 percent in 2002/03 to 70.1 percent in 2005/06. This reflects an annual labour force growth rate of 5.7 percent. Youth as nationally defined (18-30 years) has a decline in the proportion of working age people participating in the labour market. The participation rate declined from 85.7 percent in 2002/03 to 81.3 percent in 2005/06.

Table 4.1: Labour Participation Rate for Persons 14-64 years by Sex, Residence and Age Group (%)

	2002/03		2005/06		Labour force growth rate
	(%)	LFPR	(%)	LFP R	
Sex					
Male	47.4	80.5	48.6	83.5	4.4
Female	52.6	80.0	51.4	80.9	2.9
Rural/Urban					
Urban	15.2	74.0	15.0	69.5	3.2
Rural	83.6	80.4	85.0	84.7	4.2
Region					
Kampala	6.5	76.1	5.7	65.5	-0.9
Central	23.8	79.2	24.1	84.4	4.0
Eastern	26.6	81.4	24.6	84.1	0.9
Northern	18.1	83.9	18.2	80.4	3.8
Western	24.9	78.7	27.4	83.5	6.9
Age Group					
15-24	30.3	65.9	32.3	70.1	5.7
18-30	48.1	85.7	40.8	81.3	-1.9
Uganda	100.0	80.3	100.0	82.0	3.6
Number		9,761,600		10,882,600	

Three quarters of the labour force did not have secondary education

4.2 Educational Levels of the Labour Force

Table 4.2 shows that the labour force has become more educated. This is reflected in the decline in the annual labour force growth rate of those with no formal education by 3.2 percent and an increase for those with primary (5.2%) and secondary (4.4%).

Table 4.2: Labour Participation Rate for Persons 14-64 years by Educational Levels (%)

	2002/03		2005/06		Labour force growth rate
	(%)	LFPR	(%)	LFP R	
Education Level					
No formal schooling	17.1	91.2	13.9	91.6	-3.2
Primary	59.3	79.3	62.2	84.8	5.2
Secondary	18.3	78.4	17.7	76.7	4.4
Post secondary	5.8	94.5	5.6	88.2	2.2
Do not know	47.4	94.3	0.1	94.5	

Uganda	100.0	80.3	100.0	82.0	3.6
---------------	--------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	------------

80 percent of the labour force is employed

4.3 Employment to Population Ratio

The Employment to Population Ratio (EPR) is defined as total employment of the population aged 14–64 years as a percentage of the total population in the same age group¹¹. This ratio indicates the extent to which the population is involved in productive labour market activities. It also presents an indication on how the economy generates work. Table 4.3 shows that EPR has increased from nearly 78 percent in 2002/03 to about 80 percent in 2005/06. The annualized growth rates by sex shows that males recorded significantly higher rates (4.7%) compared to their female counterparts (3.6%).

The urban areas experienced higher growth in the employment compared to rural areas. This means that persons in urban areas are more likely to get employed than those in rural areas. Regional variations in the EPR showed with Kampala and Northern region with a declining rate while other regions showed an increase in EPR.

Table 4.3: Employment to Population Ratio for Persons 14-64 years

	2002/03		2005/06		Employment Growth Rate
	%	Employment-to-population	%	Employment-to-population	
Sex					
Male	47.8	78.4	48.7	82.0	4.7
Female	52.2	76.7	51.3	79.0	3.6
Rural/Urban					
Urban	13.9	65.3	14.3	65.1	5.2
Rural	86.1	79.9	85.7	83.7	4.0
Region					
Kampala	5.6	63.5	5.3	60.1	2.3
Central	23.7	76.0	24.1	82.9	4.8
Eastern	27.0	79.5	24.9	83.5	1.4
Northern	18.6	83.0	17.9	77.4	2.9
Western	25.2	76.9	27.8	83.0	7.4
Uganda	100.0	77.5	100.0	80.4	4.1

4.4 Status in Employment

Status in employment provides information on the changes in workers' behavior and identification by type of worker. Employment status is broadly categorized into two groups, namely self-employed and paid employees.

¹¹ UBOS, Report on Labour Market Conditions Uganda 2006

The self employed include employers, who could create jobs for others; own

account workers, and unpaid family workers who assist in the household enterprises. The employees include permanent and temporary employees.

A sizeable proportion of self employed persons can be an indication of low growth in the formal economy and high rate of job creation in the informal economy. A situation where a large proportion of the employed is constituted by unpaid family workers is a probable indicator of poor development, limited job creation, widespread poverty and often a large rural economy¹².

About 70% of the working population is self-employed in agriculture

The data in Table 4.4 shows that the percentage of the self employed in agriculture increased by 11.2 percent between the 2 survey periods. This may be partially due to the failure to get non-agricultural work, as explained by a negative growth rate for those persons who are self employed in non agriculture activities (9.4%) per annum. The proportion of permanent employees in total employment has remained below 5 percent while that of temporary employees has grown at a rate of 12 percent. Having the majority of employees in temporary employment means that such persons are snipped to fall back into the unemployed any time.

Table 4.4: Employment Status of Working Population 14-64 years (%)

Employment Status	2002/03	2005/06	Employment Annual Growth Rate
Self employment in agriculture	62.6	69.7	11.2
Self employment in non-agriculture	22.3	13.4	-9.4
Permanent employee	4.8	4.6	6.3
Temporary Employee	10.3	11.6	11.6
Not stated	-	0.5	-
Total	100.0	100.0	

4.5 Industry and Sector of Employment

Seven in every ten persons are employed in agriculture

The sectoral distribution of the actively employed can provide insights into a number of issues related to the labour market in Uganda. There has been no shift in the sectoral composition of employment as agriculture remained the major sector of employment increasing from 66 percent in 2002/03 to 73 percent in 2005/06. This presents a challenge to the Government of creating an environment that will lead to creation of jobs to match the growth in the labour force.

¹² ILO, Key Indicators of Labour market-3rd edition, 2003
29

Table 4.5: Employment of Working Population 14-64 Years by Industry

Industry/Sector of Employment	2002/03	2005/06
Industry		
Agriculture, Hunting	65.5	73.3
Sales	12.5	8.1
Manufacturing	6.5	4.2
Education	2.8	2.6
Transport, Storage and	2.1	2.0
Others	4.7	9.8
Sector of Employment		
Primary	65.5	73.3
Manufacturing	7.7	4.2
Service	26.8	22.5
Total	100.0	100.0

4.6 Occupational Structure

The distribution of the workforce in different occupations is presented in Table 4.6. The Table reveals that persons employed in agriculture accounted for the largest single proportion of the total employment (70%). The more skilled occupations such as managers, professionals and technicians together accounted for only about 4 percent of the total workforce, and the proportion has not changed significantly since 2002/03.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Work Force by Occupation (%)

Occupations	2002/03	2005/06
Agriculture and Fishery Workers	63.4	70.0
Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	15.7	9.3
Elementary Occupation	9.4	9.6
Crafts and Related trade workers	4.5	3.5
Managers, Legislators, Professionals and Associate Professional	3.6	3.6
Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly	1.9	2.2
Clerks	1.4	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0

4.7 Wages

Wages are a substantial form of income, accruing to a high proportion of the economically active population, namely persons in paid employment (employees). Information on wage levels is essential to evaluate the living

standards and conditions of work and life of this group of workers in both industrialized and developing economies. Wage data on the country's workforce is crucial for the formulation and successful implementation of national development programmes and projects. Periodic generation of such data is useful in collective bargaining, wage fixing, economic and employment policy formulation and monitoring wage trends. It can also be used for investment decisions and career guidance. The information presented below only covers cash payments from all jobs performed by persons in a month.

4.7.1 Wage in Paid Employment

Public sector employees earn five times more than those in the private sector

The Table 4.7 reveals that overall; persons employed in public sector earn five times more than those in private sector. Abundance of unskilled labour and low levels of human capital are cited as a possible explanation for lower wages/salaries in the private sector. The results further show that in private sector, females were paid much lower wages compared to the males. The male wage per month more than doubles that of females. Also wage inequality is noticeable among the rural-urban residence of the paid employee, as persons working in urban areas earn thrice the earnings in rural areas.

Table 4.7 further indicates that median wage increases with level of education. The findings of the survey revealed that employees with post secondary education earn more than twice the wages of those with incomplete secondary education and below. However, the difference is smaller for the public sector.

Table 4.7: Median Monthly Nominal Wages for Wage Employees ('000)

	Public	Private	Total
Sex			
Male	150.0	40.0	48.0
Female	140.0	18.1	20.0
Rural/Urban			
Urban	176.0	72.4	90.0
Rural	143.0	25.0	28.0
Education level			
No Formal schooling	35.0	18.1	18.1
Primary	60.0	27.2	27.2
Some secondary	117.0	63.4	70.0
Post secondary	150.0	120.0	150.0
Uganda	148.0	30.0	36.2

4.7.2 Wage by Occupation

Wages for individual occupations provide more interesting information than broad averages covering many or all occupations within an industry. The use of occupational wages narrows the scope of coverage and provides a focus on particular types of workers, and often on a particular industry or economic activity.

Employees in agriculture and elementary occupations are the least paid

Persons working in elementary occupations were least paid with about (Shs.24, 000) per month followed by those in agriculture (Shs.27, 000) as indicated in Table 4.8. The very low wages of those employed in agriculture and elementary occupations underlines the plight of those engaged in those occupations. Employees in service occupations earned Shs 50,000 per month on average. The earning capacity is very low yet more than 90 percent of the workforce is engaged in agriculture, services, crafts and occupations in the secondary labour markets. Only managers and legislators in the private sector were better paid than those in the public sector.

Table 4.8: Median Monthly Nominal Wages for Wage Employees by Occupation ('000)

Occupation	2005/06		
	Public	Private	Total
Legislators, senior Officials and Manager	120.0	181.0	120.0
Professionals	300.0	170.0	250.0
Technicians and Associate Professionals	150.0	120.0	148.0
Clerks	110.0	72.4	80.0
Service Workers and Shop and Market Sale	80.0	45.0	50.0
Agriculture and Fishery Workers	58.1	27.2	27.2
Crafts and Related trade workers	180.0	84.0	90.5
Plant and Machine Operators and Assemble	94.0	90.5	90.5
Elementary Occupation	60.0	21.7	23.5

4.7.3 Share of Wage Employment in Non-Agricultural Employment

The proportion of wage/salary employment in non-agricultural employment is an indicator of employment opportunities, especially for developing countries, because it conveys considerable information about the nature of employment opportunities. Table 4.9 shows that overall 47 percent of all the employed persons in non-agricultural employment are employees.

About half (53%) of the employed males in non-agricultural employment are employees compared to about one in every three (36%) female employees.

Kampala had close to 56 percent of its non-agricultural employment working as employees followed by Western and Eastern region both with 46 percent.

About half of the persons in non-agriculture are employees

The findings show that there is a positive relationship between level of education and the population of employees in non-agricultural employment. Table 4.9 further reveals that the higher the level of education, the higher the chances of getting a non-agricultural employment as about eight in every ten persons with post secondary education had non-agricultural employment compared to only three in every ten persons with no formal education.

Table 4.9: Distribution of Wage Employment in Non-Agricultural Employment by Sex, Residence and Educational Levels (%)

	Persons Employed in Non-Agric sector	Wage Earners (Employees)	(%)
Sex			
Male	1,745,692	930,654	53.3
Female	1,023,389	363,759	35.5
Rural/Urban			
Urban	1,171,242	598,810	51.1
Rural	1,597,839	695,603	43.5
Region			
Kampala	539,066	299,986	55.6
Central	859,159	384,734	44.8
Eastern	455,074	207,030	45.5
Northern	389,924	162,596	41.7
Western	525,859	240,068	45.7
Educational Levels			
No Formal schooling	172,219	53,032	30.8
Primary	1,340,496	495,103	36.9
Secondary	762,072	369,855	48.5
Post secondary	475,947	366,193	76.9
Do not know	3,818	2,135	55.9
Uganda	2,769,081	1,294,413	46.7

4.8 Time Use

Time use statistics give information about how persons aged 14-64 years spend their time. It includes details about the proportions of time spent on


economic and Care Labour activities. In this survey, Care Labour activities included cooking, fetching water and firewood and looking after the young and the sick.

There is a wide range of potential use of data on how people spend their time. Time-use data improve our understanding of individual and household activities especially with respect to time allocation and also improve our knowledge of the well-being of the nation. In this section, important functions of time-use data for informing public policy and for better understanding of time spent on activities and well-being of individuals are discussed.

Figure 4.1 shows that men spent about one hour more per day than women on economic activity. The females spent about 9 hours per day on Care Labour activities compared to males who spent about 1 hour. The wide disparity between males and females in terms of time spent on Care Labour activities is probably because men generally do not engage in house keeping activities. In general, people spent more time on care labour activities than on economic activities.

Females spent 9 hours more on Care Labour activities compared to 1 hour for males

Figure 4.1: Average Time spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity Per day by Sex (Hours)



Persons in urban areas on average spent four hours more per day on economic activities than their rural counterparts. On the other hand, rural residents spent more time on Care Labour activities than their urban

Persons without formal education spent more time on Care Labour activities

counterparts as shown in Table 4.10. By region, the average time spent on economic activities per day is longest in Kampala (12 hours) and least in Northern Region (5 hours). The findings show that people in the Northern region spent most of their time doing Care Labour activities.

There is a notable relationship between educational levels and hours spent on economic and Care Labour activities. Worth noting is that the time spent on economic activities generally decreased with decrease in level of education. However, persons with no formal education and primary education spent more time on Care Labour activities compared to those with above primary education.

Table 4.10: Average Time spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity

per day (Hours) by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Economic Activity	Care Labour Activity*
Rural/Urban		
Urban	10.1	4.4
Rural	6.0	5.3
Region		
Kampala	11.8	4.3
Central	7.2	5.6
Eastern	5.9	4.5
Northern	4.8	6.2
Western	6.8	4.9
Education Levels		
No formal schooling	6.0	7.2
Primary	6.1	5.3
Some secondary	7.9	4.1
Completed S6	9.7	2.4
Post secondary	9.3	2.6
Uganda	6.0	7.2

* Care Labour activities include: looking after children and caring for the sick, fetching water, firewood and cooking


4.8.1 Time Use by Age

Age is an important factor in determining the number of hours spent on economic and Care Labour activities. Figure 4.2 shows that the average hours worked per day on economic activities increases with increasing age up to age 30-34, thereafter declines with age up to 55-59 and then starts rising again. The hours worked per day on Care Labour activities reaches the peak at age group 20-24 and thereafter starts declining. It is notable from the Figure 4.2 that the gap between hours spent on economic and Care Labour activities generally widens as age increases. The increase in

the number of hours worked for older persons may be an indication that they tend to spend their retirement period working for a living.

Figure 4.2: Average Time Spent (Hours) on Economic and Care

Labour Activity per day by Age Groups



4.8.2 Time Use and Occupation

The Table 4.11 below shows the average time spent on economic and Care Labour activities per day by occupation. Service, shop and market sales persons spent more time on economic activities (12 hours) while agriculture and fisheries workers worked for the lowest number of hours (5). Agriculture and fisheries workers spent the highest number of hours on non- economic activities (6 hours).

Persons in agriculture worked for only 5 hours per day

Table 4.11: Average Time Spent on Economic and Care Labour Activity per day by Occupation (Hours)

Occupation	Economic Activity	Care Labour Activity
Legislators, senior Officials and Manager	10.2	1.7
Professionals	9.4	1.7
Technicians and Associate Professionals	9.4	2.5
Clerks	10.0	2.5
Service Workers and Shop and Market Sale	12.4	4.9
Agriculture and Fishery Workers	5.0	6.1
Crafts and Related trade workers	9.9	2.5
Plant and Machine Operators and Assemble	10.3	2.9
Elementary Occupation	9.1	3.3
Uganda	6.6	5.1

4.9 Unemployment

Unemployment refers to a situation whereby persons are without work, available for work in the last seven days but did not necessarily take steps to search for work. The unemployment rate measures the number of unemployed persons as a percentage of the labour force.

The Table 4.12 reveals an unemployment rate of 1.9 percent in 2005/06, compared to 3.5 percent observed in 2002/03. Unemployment remained predominantly an urban problem as persons in urban areas are six times more likely to be unemployed compared to their rural counterparts. Considering the total size of the population, the number of unemployed population is rather low in Uganda. In view of the existing realities, such low rates of open unemployment are expected in a country such as Uganda since the participants in the labour force are compelled to engage in some work even for a few hours in order to subsist with their family.

Current unemployment rate is 1.9%

Table 4.12: Unemployment Rate by Sex and Residence (%)

	2002/03		2005/06	
	Number	Unemployment Rate	Number	Unemployment Rate
Sex				
Male	120,206	2.6	89,596	1.7
Female	212,745	4.2	120,159	2.1
Rural/Urban				
Urban	151,335	7.6	104,925	6.4
Rural	181,616	1.7	104,831	1.1
Uganda	332,951	3.5	209,754	1.9

4.10 Underemployment

The 'standard' unemployment rate does not provide a real picture of the supply and demand balance of the labour market. It also does not adequately reflect the degree of inefficiency that prevails in the labour market. Alternative indicators such as underemployment rates and work intensity are therefore necessary to supplement the standard indicator of unemployment rate in revealing the labour market reality in Uganda.

Underemployment is one of the least studied topics in Uganda, yet it is a major concern of data users who need a thorough understanding of available workforce resources and unemployment. There are individuals in the workforce who are not fully utilizing their skills, education, or experience in their current employment. These individuals are important workforce

resources because they have the capabilities to move into occupations that demand greater skills, education, or experience.

4.10.1 Time-Related Underemployment

A person is classified as time-underemployed if she or he has worked less than 40 hours a week and is willing and available to work more hours. Table 4.13 shows that, overall, in terms of time spent working, 12 percent of workers were under employed in 2005/06 compared to 17 percent in 2002/03. The rates for both males and females decreased by about 4 percentage points between two surveys respectively. The decrease in underemployment rate was highest among the rural population (4.6 percentage points).

Time-related underemployment has reduced by 4 percentage points

More persons in the Northern region were underemployed


The Eastern region registered a notable decrease in underemployment rate of 12 percentage points between the two survey periods whereas the Northern region was the only one that registered an increase in the underemployment rate. All education categories registered a decrease in the underemployment rate. Figure 4.3 reveals that under employment was highest among the youths.

Table 4.13: Time-Related Underemployment for Persons 14-64 years by Selected Characteristics (%)

Selected Characteristics	2002/03	2005/06
Sex		
Male	18.3	14.1
Female	14.6	10.1
Rural/Urban		
Urban	10.4	8.7
Rural	17.4	12.6
Region		
Kampala	8.3	7.3
Central	19.3	15.7
Eastern	21.1	8.9
Northern	17.8	19.1
Western	9.3	8.2
Education Level		
No formal schooling	14.4	11.7
Primary	17.8	12.9
Secondary	15.4	10.5
Post secondary	10.1	8.8
Do not know	15.4	7.0
Uganda	16.9	12.1

Figure 4.3: Time-Related Underemployment for Persons 14-64 years by

Age Group (%)



4.11 Summary of Findings

The annual labour force growth rate in Uganda was 3.6 percent. The majority of workers were in rural areas. Three quarters of the labourforce had lower than secondary level education. Majority of the people were employed in the agricultural sector. The earnings from the private sector were five times less than those from the public sector.

CHAPTER FIVE

HEALTH

5.0 Introduction

The Government of Uganda (GoU) has established clear goals for improving the health of Ugandans. The programme goal of the Health Sector Strategic Plan (HSSP II) 2005/06-2009/10 is “reduced morbidity and mortality from the major causes of ill health, premature deaths, and reduced disparities therein”.

The Uganda Poverty Status Report¹³ reveals that 16.3 percent of households identified health-related problems as the most important factors that influenced a decrease in welfare.

The UNHS 2005/06 captured various variables that are used to analyze the health status of the population. These are: prevalence of disease, availability and utilization of health facilities, distance to the health facilities, and the major reasons why no medical attention was sought for those who fell sick but did not visit a health facility. In addition, a module on malaria and usage of Insecticide Treated Nets (ITNs) was included. This chapter presents the health status of Uganda’s population based on the survey findings on these variables.

5.1 Prevalence of Disease

The survey sought the frequency of occurrence of a disease particularly, whether a household member fell sick in the 30 days preceding the date of the survey.

The findings in Table 5.1 show that, 40 percent of the population fell sick in the 30 days preceding the date of the survey. This was significantly higher than the 2002/03 survey figure of 29 percent. The proportion of people in rural areas that reported an illness (42%) was higher than that in urban areas (33%). Comparison between sexes showed slight variations between females (43%) and males (38%).

**40% of the population
fell sick 30 days prior
to the survey**

¹³ Uganda Poverty Status Report, 2005 Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda

Regional variations show that the highest percentage of persons that fell sick was reported by the Eastern region (49%). The most affected persons were the older persons (61%) and under five years (56%); and this pattern is consistent with the findings in the 2002/03 survey (45% and 43% respectively).

Table 5.1: Distribution of Population that fell Sick by Selected Background Characteristics (%)

Background Characteristics	2002/03			2005/06		
	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes
Rural/Urban						
Urban	26.5	28.6	27.6	30.9	35.2	33.1
Rural	28.3	29.9	29.1	39.4	43.9	41.7
Region						
Kampala	27.1	29.6	28.4	24.5	28.0	26.4
Central	28.1	28.6	28.4	39.3	43.3	41.2
Eastern	34.1	37.7	35.9	45.4	51.8	48.7
Northern	24.7	25.5	25.2	38.8	43.3	41.2
Western	23.9	25.4	24.7	32.3	35.7	34.0
Age						
Under 5	43.9	41.6	42.8	55.6	55.4	55.5
5-17	22.1	22.9	22.5	31.4	31.8	31.6
18-30	23.2	26.9	25.3	30.1	38.5	34.7
31-59	26.7	33.7	30.3	39.0	51.1	45.1
60+	41.9	49.5	45.3	54.5	66.0	60.6
Uganda	28.1	29.8	28.9	38.1	42.7	40.4

Respondents that reported falling sick in the 30 days preceding the interview, were further asked to give the three major symptoms they experienced during the illness. It was on the basis of these symptoms that the prevalence of an illness was analyzed. Only one major symptom was considered.

Malaria is still the leading cause of illness and death in Uganda. World wide, malaria claims the lives of a million people a year mostly young children. However, it can be largely controlled through education, prevention and when illness strikes, immediate treatment and care.

Table 5.2 shows that about half of the study population that fell sick, experienced malaria/fever symptoms followed by respiratory tract infections (14%) and diarrhea (9%). Diarrhea prevalence was more among persons in rural areas than those in urban areas. It more than doubled from 4 percent

One in two of the population that fell sick reported symptoms of Malaria/Fever

in 2002/03 to 9 percent in 2005/06. However, there was a notable decline in prevalence of malaria among the urban population from 61 percent in 2002/03 to 49 percent in 2005/06.

Table 5.2: Population by Type of Illness/Major Symptoms and Residence (%)

Illness	Rural/Urban					
	2002/03			2005/06		
	Urban	Rural	Uganda	Urban	Rural	Uganda
Malaria/Fever	62.7	57.8	58.5	48.9	53.3	49.6
Respiratory Infections	15.1	12.9	13.2	14.2	14.7	14.1
Diarrhea	2.2	4.4	4.1	7.3	9.8	9.4
Injury	1.3	1.0	1.0	5.4	7.0	6.8
Skin Infections	1.6	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.2
Others*	17.2	20.9	20.4	16.3	17.0	16.9

*Others includes fainting, pain on passing urine, coughing blood, genital sores, mental disorder, child-birth related, serious headache and others

The Western region was the most affected by malaria with 57 percent as shown in Table 5.3. Kampala and the Northern region were the most affected by respiratory infections (19% and 18% respectively) and the Northern region was also most hit by diarrheal diseases (14%) compared to other regions.

Table 5.3: Population by Type of Illness, Region and Age Groups (%)

	Malaria	Respiratory infections	Diarrhea	Injury	Skin Infection	Others	Total
Region							
Kampala	53.2	18.6	5.6	4.2	2.1	16.1	100.0
Central	50.9	15.9	5.9	9.7	3.1	14.6	100.0
Eastern	51.4	11.2	9.7	6.6	3.8	17.1	100.0
Northern	35.9	17.6	13.8	6.1	3.8	22.6	100.0
Western	57.4	12.3	9.6	4.8	2.2	13.9	100.0
Age							
Under 5	60.0	14.7	11.0	4.6	4.2	5.3	100.0
5-17	50.3	15.9	6.9	6.8	3.3	16.8	100.0
18-30	47.3	12.0	9.2	6.7	2.2	22.8	100.0
31-59	42.9	12.3	10.5	7.7	2.7	23.8	100.0
60+	33.7	14.2	12.1	11.6	3.2	25.0	100.0
Uganda	49.6	14.1	9.4	6.8	3.2	16.9	100.0

Most people lost up to one week irrespective of the illness suffered

5.2 Days Lost due to Illness

The number of days lost by any individual was used to determine the severity of an illness. This has an adverse effect on the productive capacity of an individual. The UNHS 2005/06 sought to establish the number of days one lost due to the major illness suffered. The findings presented in Table 5.4 show that each of the illnesses listed caused a loss of up to one week to most people.

Table 5.4: Population by Type of Illness and Number of Days Lost (%)

Illness	0-7 days	8-14 days	15-30 days	Uganda
Diarrhea	81.9	12.6	5.5	100.0
Malaria/Fever	86.7	9.0	4.3	100.0
Respiratory	89.6	7.0	3.4	100.0
Skin Infection	82.8	11.7	5.5	100.0
injury	73.5	14.1	12.4	100.0
Others	82.2	10.0	7.8	100.0

5.3 Medical Attention Sought

Government through the HSSP II and in collaboration with NGOs and the Private sector are undertaking collective efforts to increase and improve the delivery of health services through health centers II-IV. Home-based management of fever has also been introduced, where free pre-packaged malaria treatment for children is provided¹⁴.

Majority of the Population sought medical attention from Private clinics

The findings in Table 5.5 show that, generally there was an increase in use of clinics (from 40% to 45%) between 2002/03 and 2005/06. It is also evident that the majority of the population in Uganda (45%) sought medical attention from clinics followed by the health centers (26%). According to the qualitative module, people reported that they preferred private clinics because health workers acted professionally and others even offered services on credit.

¹⁴ National Center for Infectious Diseases, Division of Parasitic Diseases, Ministry of Health, April 2004

Table 5.5: Population by Type of Medical Attention Sought and Residence (%)

Medical Attention	2002/03			2005/06		
	Urban	Rural	Uganda	Urban	Rural	Uganda
Home Treatment	11.8	13.3	13.1	2.4	2.4	2.4
Pharmacy/Drug shop	12.2	15.3	14.9	12.1	13.1	12.9
Clinic	53.9	37.2	39.5	53.8	43.3	44.7
Health Center	6.2	20.1	18.2	13.6	27.7	25.9
Hospital	15.0	12.1	12.6	15.5	7.6	8.7
Traditional Doctor	0.6	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2
Others	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.3	0.9	0.8

5.4 Distance to Health Facility

According to HSSP I¹⁵, the GOU targeted to have health facilities within a radius of 5km to the Communities. Table 5.6 shows that 48 percent of the households reported that they visited clinics that are within a radius of 5km. It is also worth noting that most hospitals visited were located in a radius of over 5km (26%). The qualitative module also cited long distances as one of the factors limiting access to the health facilities.

48% of the households visited private clinics that were within a radius of 5 km

Table 5.6: Population by Distance to Health Facility (%)

Health Facility	2002/03		2005/06	
	Within 5km	Over 5km	Within 5km	Over 5km
Home Treatment/ Community Health worker	-	-	2.0	0.2
Pharmacy/Drug Shop	17.5	8.8	14.8	4.2
Clinic	48.7	32.0	48.1	34.7
Health Center	23.1	23.7	25.2	32.3
Hospital	10.7	35.6	5.4	26.4
Traditional Doctor	-	-	1.1	1.6
Others	-	-	0.9	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0


5.5 Reasons for not Consulting

Of all the people that fell sick, 13 percent did not seek any medical attention in 2005/06. Despite Government efforts to bring health services nearer to the people, there are still some who do not utilize the available health services. The UNHS 2005/06 inquired into the reasons why people do not seek attention from medical doctors, nurses or traditional healers. Results in

¹⁵ HSSP I 2000-2005

Figure 5.1 show that, 'illness being mild' (46%) was the major reason for not seeking medical attention followed by cost of consultation / drugs (32%).

Figure 5.1: Major Reasons for not Seeking Medical Attention (%)



*Others includes staff unavailable, drugs not available and others

5.6 Usage of Mosquito Nets

Insecticide-Treated mosquito Nets (ITNs) are among the most effective tools for prevention of malaria. The 2000/01 UDHS estimated that only 13% of Ugandan households had a mosquito net whereas only 8% of children under five usually slept under one¹⁶. In 2005, GoU abolished taxes on mosquito nets in an effort to make protection against malaria more affordable to the people¹⁷.

17% of the population slept under a mosquito net

Table 5.7 shows that 17 percent of the population had slept under a mosquito net the night prior to the date of interview. This gives a proxy of how many people in Uganda use mosquito nets. The Table further shows variations between rural and urban usage of mosquito nets. There are however, no significant differences between males and females.

¹⁶ The Uganda Demographic Health Survey, UBOS, 2000/01

¹⁷ Poverty Eradication Action Plan 2004/2-2007/8, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Table 5.7: Population that Slept under a Mosquito Net (%)

Category	2005/06	
	Mosquito Net usage	
Rural/Urban		
Urban		37.0
Rural		13.1
Region		
Kampala		45.9
Central		15.7
Eastern		16.8
Northern		17.3
Western		10.9
Sex		
Male		16.1
Female		17.5
Sex		
Age		
Below 5 years		19.8
5 years and Above		16.1
Uganda		16.8

5.7 Anti-Malarial Drugs for Pregnant Women

The UNHS 2005/06 sought to investigate the types of anti-malarial drugs pregnant women took for prophylaxis purposes (prevention of malaria). Findings in Table 5.8 reveal that 78 percent of pregnant women took SP/Fansidar followed by chloroquine (17%). Twice as many pregnant women in the rural areas (18%) than in the urban (9%) took chloroquine as a measure of preventing malaria.

78% of pregnant women took Fansidar for prevention of Malaria

Table 5.8: Population of Pregnant Women that took Anti-Malaria Drugs

Type of Anti-Malarial drug	2005/06 (%)		
	Urban	Rural	Uganda
SP/Fansidar	86.8	76.3	78.4
Chloroquine	9.0	18.3	16.5
Camaquine	0.3	0.8	0.7
Quinine	2.3	2.7	2.6
Other	1.6	1.9	1.9

5.8 Right Dosage for Fansidar

Pregnant women and their unborn babies are particularly vulnerable to malaria, which is the major cause of low birth weight in newborns, anemia and infant death¹⁸. According to UDHS (2000/01), one third of all Ugandan women, took drugs against malaria during pregnancy¹⁹. Recently, Uganda adopted the Intermittent Presumptive Treatment (IPT) with SP/Fansidar as its strategy for malaria prevention in pregnant women, recommending 2 doses at least a month apart in the second and third trimester. The scientific benefit is realized after taking a second dose. This provides real protection against malaria infection.

43% of pregnant women took the recommended dose

The 2005/06 UNHS estimated the total population of women in Uganda at 14.0 million, of which 5.9 million were of reproductive age (15-49) and about 3.1 million got pregnant during the past 5 years. Table 5.9 shows that the proportion of pregnant women of reproductive age (15-49) that took the recommended dose of SP/Fansidar was 43 percent. There were no significant variations between the proportion of women in rural and urban areas. The Western region registered a larger proportion of pregnant women that observed the recommended dose (57%), followed by Kampala and the Central region with 49% and 44% respectively. In addition, the qualitative module revealed that Communities exhibited high levels of awareness with regard to the recommended anti-malarial treatment for protecting women from possible death, anemia, miscarriage and still births.

Table 5.9: Pregnant Women 15-49 years that took the Recommended Dose for SP/Fansidar by Residence (%)

Residence	Recommended dose for SP/Fansidar
Rural/Urban	
Urban	42.6
Rural	43.4
Region	
Kampala	48.9
Central	44.4
Eastern	31.5
Northern	33.7
Western	56.7
Uganda	43.4

¹⁸ The Millennium Development Goals, United Nations New York, May 2005

¹⁹ Uganda Demographic and Health Survey, UBOS, 2000/01

5.9 Summary of Findings

The findings in this chapter show that the general prevalence of disease in Uganda's population has increased since UNHS 2002/03. The malaria/fever prevalence decreased from 60 percent in UNHS 2002/03 to 50 percent in UNHS 2005/06. All the illnesses considered in this chapter caused a loss of up to one week to most people. The majority of the people who fell sick sought medical attention from private clinics since most of these were located within a radius of 5km from the Communities. Illness being mild was the major reason why people did not seek medical attention. Other reasons were cost and long distances to the health facilities. As regards anti-malarial drugs, most pregnant women took SP/Fansidar and 43 percent of them took the recommended dose.

CHAPTER SIX

HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE AND POVERTY ESTIMATES

6.0 Introduction

Collection of consumption and non-consumption expenditure data remains a key component in the National Household Surveys. These data have been useful in monitoring the living standards of Ugandans. Section one of this chapter briefly discusses the methods used in the analysis. Changes in household expenditures in general and household consumption expenditure in particular are discussed in section two. In section three, a discussion of the poverty estimates prior to the summary and conclusions is made. In keeping with previous poverty works (Appleton, 2001a; and Appleton & Ssewanyana, 2003), poverty estimates were derived by following the methods applied to earlier surveys presented in Appleton (2001a, b)²⁰.

6.1 Methodology

In measuring poverty, there are three critical issues: how to measure welfare, how to set the poverty line and how to aggregate over individuals. These issues are addressed in details in Appendix I.

6.1.1 Data Transformation

The Uganda National Household Survey of 2002/03 (UNHS 2002/03) and the Uganda National Household Survey of 2005/06 (UNHS 2005/06) have some similarities and differences that are worth noting for measuring poverty. First, both surveys share the same sampling frame based on the 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census. But differ in terms of stratification. The UNHS 2002/03 used a district as a stratum divided into urban, other urban and rural areas; whereas UNHS 2005/06 used a region as stratum divided into rural and urban. Second, UNHS 2002/03 visited the sampled Enumeration Areas (EAs) once, whereas UNHS 2005/06 visited EAs twice. Third, both surveys were conducted during the same months²¹. Fourth, the two surveys shared very similar consumption sections, with

²⁰ While methodological issues have been raised about measuring poverty in Uganda, we must be aware of the large number of methodological decisions, both theoretical and practical, that has to be taken.

²¹ The timing of UNHS 2005/06 coincided with the National elections but we cannot determine the extent to which this might have affected the income poverty estimates presented in this chapter.

almost the same list of item codes and identical recall periods. Nevertheless, the 2005/06 survey included a few items not listed separately in the survey of 2002/03²². In addition, UNHS 2005/06 captured health and education expenditures at both individual and household levels unlike UNHS 2002/03 where such information was captured only at household level²³. Fifth, the UNHS 2005/06 covered 7,426 households whereas UNHS 2002/03 covered 9,711 households, but both surveys were nationally representative.

Different recall periods were used to capture information on different sub-components of household expenditures. While a 7-day recall period was used for expenditure on food, beverages and tobacco, a 30-day recall period was used in the case of household consumption expenditure on non-durable goods and frequently purchased services. For the semi-durable and durable goods and services, and non-consumption expenditures, a 365-day recall period was used. For details on the consumption module refer to Appendix III.

In both surveys, all purchases by household members and items received free as gifts were valued and recorded as per the current prices. The items consumed out of home produce were valued at the current farm-gate/producer prices while rent for owner occupied houses was also imputed at current market prices. Food consumption includes food consumed from own production, purchases and free collection/gifts.

Expenditure data are collected on item-by-item basis. The expenditures were aggregated according to the recall period used and by broader sub-components of expenditures to a household level. Given the different recall periods used to collect data on household expenditures, some conversion factors were applied to change the data on a 30-day monthly basis²⁴. After which all the different sub-components of the expenditures were aggregated to derive the total expenditures at household level. There is a

²² The reader should be aware that household surveys in Uganda are constantly evolving, a fact that, although welcome, might introduce problem of comparability over time. For instance, new areas of consumption have cropped up. To narrow the discussion to UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06, some of these items were areas of new consumption such as generators/lawn mowers fuel, expenses on phones not owned; and others as a result of breaking down the items into their different forms such as combination of own mobile and fixed phones expenses, imputed rent separated between owned household and free house. Also to be noted is the introduction on new codes not originally reflected in the questionnaire. Health and education expenditures were captured both at individual and household level. But in 2002/03 such information was captured at household level.

²³ This approach does, to some extent, reduce on the measurement errors in reporting health and education expenses.

²⁴ There were 5 households dropped from UNHS 2005/06 due to missing expenses on food, beverages and tobacco. This led to a reduction in the number of households used in analysis from 7,426 to 7,421. On the other hand, a hedonic regression was employed to impute rent for 76 households who had missing information.

distinction between consumption expenditure and total expenditures. The former refers

to expenditure excluding non-consumption expenditure, whereas the latter includes the non-consumption expenditure sub-component.

Further adjustments were made in the construction of the consumption aggregate²⁵ used later on in the estimation of poverty estimates. These adjustments included accounting for inter-temporal²⁶ and spatial price variations²⁷, revaluation of foods derived from own consumption into market prices and finally accounting for household composition in terms of sex and age.

The UNHS 2005/06 survey was a nationally representative household survey, covering all districts in Uganda. For consistency and comparability over time, the poverty estimates reported in Appleton (2001) and Appleton & Ssewanyana (2003) adjust for geographical coverage of the surveys. They excluded the Acholi sub-region and districts of Bundibugyo and Kasese, as these areas were not covered in the household survey of 1999/00 (UNHS 1999/00) due to insurgency at the time of the survey. The exclusion of areas that are among the poorest in the Country would to some extent, lead to a downward bias in poverty estimates since the excluded areas are among the poorest in the Country. This report focuses on the household surveys of 1992/93, 2002/03²⁸ and 2005/06 to provide a complete picture of the level of poverty in Uganda. However, we also report poverty estimates based on the 2005/06 survey excluding those districts not covered in UNHS 1999/00. The detailed discussions that follow provide a full picture of poverty in Uganda unless stated otherwise. Throughout the chapter, we report expenditure at the mean and on a 30-day monthly basis unless stated otherwise. All estimates are weighted to give a national picture.

²⁵ Household consumption expenditure is preferred over income in assessing poverty incidence as the former can be more accurately reported by the households/individuals than the latter.

²⁶ The national composite Consumer Price Index (CPI) was used.

²⁷ Used the food index as derived from information provided in the respective household survey. This is meant to account for differences in food prices across region (rural/urban divide).

²⁸ The survey of 2002/03 excluded Pader district and some few EAs in Kitgum and Gulu districts. This represents less than 1 percent of Uganda's population according to the estimates by UBOS. Hence the survey represents full country coverage.

6.2 Consumption Expenditures

This section presents and discusses changes in expenditures between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06. First, the mean expenditure per household, per capita and per adult equivalent are presented. Second, insights into the changes in budget shares in total household expenditures between the two surveys are provided.

6.2.1 Consumption Expenditure Per Household

Table 6.1 presents the monthly consumption expenditure per household for the 2002/03 and 2005/06 after adjusting for inflation. Uganda's average household monthly expenditure rose from Shs. 136,468 in 2002/03 to Shs. 152,068 in 2005/06, representing a real increase of 11.4 percent within a period of three years. The increase is mainly driven by the observed increases in the rural areas (of 14.4 percent), while the urban areas registered an increase of only 4.2 percent over the same period.

All regions experienced a positive change between the two surveys. While the increase in expenditure per household is more pronounced in Western region with nearly 19 percent increase, Central region excluding Kampala registered the lowest increase of around 10 percent.

In addition, marked differences are observed within regions. Both the urban and rural areas of Eastern and Central region without Kampala recorded the same percentage increase of 15 percent and 11 percent respectively. In Western region, the rural areas recorded stronger increase in consumption per household compared to urban areas. The reverse is observed for Northern region. Kampala recorded the lowest change in per household consumption of only 1.5 percent over the two surveys.

Table 6.1: Consumption Expenditure Per Household (1997/98=100)

Residence	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Region						
Kampala	-	328,773	328,773	-	333,704	333,704
Central*	151,526	248,962	165,916	168,688	276,635	183,112
Eastern	103,933	184,014	112,084	120,176	212,255	129,099
Northern	67,044	141,529	72,880	70,173	150,692	80,616
Western	115,240	214,079	124,825	138,201	246,462	148,088
Uganda	111,413	258,068	136,468	127,419	268,781	152,068

Notes: * Estimates for Central region exclude Kampala

11 % increase in real monthly household expenditure between 2002/03 and 2005/06

10 % real increase
in Per capita
expenditure

6.2.2 Consumption Expenditure Per Capita

In nominal terms, the estimated mean consumption per capita in the 2005/06 survey was Shs 39,829 per person per month compared to Shs 29,899 in 2002/03 (Table 6.2). There was thus a 33.2 percent nominal increase in consumption per capita between the surveys. This implies a real rise in consumption, since the CPI rose by 24.3 percent during the period²⁹. Thus, per capita consumption expenditure rose by 9.6 percent, in real terms. The nominal increase at the national level is driven by the strong increase in rural areas of 38.8 percent.

Table 6.2: Consumption Expenditure per Capita, in Nominal Terms

	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Whole sample	23,474	70,167	29,899	32,574	79,824	39,829
Sub-sample*	23,882	73,338	30,579	33,597	84,252	41,338

*Excludes Kasese, Kitgum, Gulu and Bundibugyo

On deflating the nominal expenditure by CPI, the results reveal that, on average, the per capita consumption expenditure increased from Shs. 26,663 in 2002/03 to Shs. 29,280 in 2005/06, representing a real increase of about 9.8 percent (Table 6.3). The Central region (without Kampala city) had the highest per capita expenditure increase from Shs. 32,455 to Shs. 37,281 (about 15 percent) real increase. The Western region also registered a 15 percent real increase. On the contrary, a real decline of 10 percent is observed for Kampala, from Shs. 88,152 to Shs. 78,798 per month per capita.

On average, the urban areas recorded 6 percent decline in real per capita consumption expenditure while the rural areas recorded a 14.3 percent increase. However, significant differences are observed within regions. The picture is quite mixed for the urban areas across regions. The highest real increase is observed for Western with 20.1 percent, followed by Eastern with 6.1 percent, Central increased marginally at 0.9 percent, while Northern registered a significant decline of 4.1 percent. Considering the rural areas, the highest real increase is observed in Central region at 18.4 percent followed by Western at 15.6 percent and Eastern at 13.2 percent.

²⁹ The survey of 2005/06 covered the period from May 2005 to April 2006, during which time the composite CPI averaged 137.1 (1997/98=100). The survey of 2002/03 covered the period May 2002 to April 2003, during which time the CPI averaged 112.9.

Table 6.3: Mean Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (1997/98=100)

Residence	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Region						
Kampala	-	88,152	88,152	-	78,798	78,798
Central*	28,651	60,815	32,455	33,913	61,383	37,281
Eastern	18,490	44,012	20,474	20,927	46,700	22,945
Northern	13,199	27,472	14,332	13,722	26,337	15,525
Western	22,024	46,106	24,119	25,454	55,369	27,732
Uganda	20,929	62,605	26,663	23,930	58,768	29,280

Although simply comparing nominal estimates of consumption with the CPI is useful to obtain a ball-park figure for real consumption, two further adjustments are made for price effects when estimating poverty as discussed in section 6.1. Specifically, home consumption of food is re-valued into market prices and regional differences in food prices are adjusted. The results are as presented in Table 6.4. In the case of comparison of 2002/03 and 2005/06 survey results, both adjustments have the effect of lowering the estimated rate of real growth. After making these adjustments as well as those for inflation, real mean consumption per capita estimated from 2005/06 survey is 11.4 percent higher than the corresponding figure estimated from 2002/03 survey. This rise implies an annualized growth rate of 3.6 percent. However, this growth rate is lower than that observed between 1997 and 1999/00 of 5 percent (see Appleton, 2001). The rural areas, where the bulk of the population resides, reported stronger growth of 5 percent, while the urban areas registered a decline of 1.9 percent annualized growth rate.

Table 6.4: Adjusted Comparison of Mean Consumption Per Capita

	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
As calculated in official reports	23,475	70,173	29,900	32,574	79,824	39,829
Revaluing home consumed food at market prices	24,643	70,606	30,968	34,615	80,685	41,689
Adjusting for regional prices	25,020	68,743	31,036	35,291	78,583	41,939
Adjusting for inflation (1997/98 prices)	22,304	61,332	27,674	25,915	57,861	30,821

UNHS 2002/03 and
UNHS 2005/06
estimate stronger
growth than the
national accounts

Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) estimates of private consumption can be compared with those from the national accounts. Although the national accounts are, in part, based on the findings of the household surveys, the 2005/06 results have not yet been used. Consequently, the national accounts provide an independent estimate of overall growth between 2002/03 and 2005/06 household surveys. Table 6.5 reports the constant price estimates for private consumption from the national accounts. In order to compare Table 6.5 with the findings of the surveys, the timing of the surveys must be considered. UNHS 2002/03 was conducted from May 2002 to April 2003 whereas UNHS 2005/06 was conducted from May 2005 to April 2006. Both surveys fall half-way between a calendar and a fiscal year. In order to get an estimate from the national accounts for growth in the period between both surveys, it is most appropriate to compare real private consumption per capita with the average of figures for calendar year 2002 and FY 2002/03 (Shs. 333,700) and average figures for calendar year 2005 and FY 2005/06 (Shs. 348,600). On this basis, the national accounts imply the figure for the period of 2005/06 survey is 4.5 percent higher than that for 2002/03 survey, equivalent to an annualized growth rate of 1.5 percent. This growth rate recorded in the national accounts is lower than that estimated from the surveys. For example, if we take per capita consumption estimates in Table 6.3 we estimate an annualized growth rate of 3.2 percent. If we take the growth estimates from the surveys with full price adjustments (revaluing home consumption and using regional food price deflators), we obtain the 4 percent annualized growth estimate discussed earlier – a much higher figure than that implied by the National Accounts.

**Table 6.5: National Accounts Estimates of Real Private Consumption
Per Capita**

Fiscal year	Calendar year	Private consumption (Shs 1997/98 prices)	Population ('000s)	Private consumption per capita ('000 Sh)	Annualized growth rate (%)
2001/02		7,867,125	23,689	332.1	4.7
	2002	8,072,348	24,069	335.4	2.8
2002/03		8,118,998	24,460	331.9	0.0
	2003	8,297,243	24,851	333.9	-0.4
2003/04		8,365,964	25,255	331.3	-0.2
	2004	8,640,974	25,660	336.8	0.9
2004/05		8,959,440	26,077	343.6	3.7
	2005	9,215,502	26,495	347.8	3.2
2005/06		9,405,564	26,926	349.3	1.7

Source: i) Private Consumption and Population figures from Statistical Abstract, 2006
ii) Private consumption per capita and annualized growth rates, Authors' calculations

Notes: i) Population estimates were revised after the Population and Housing Census, 2002
 ii) National Accounts revised in 2003.

The results in Table 6.5 are based on per capita basis. Instead the household size was adjusted to take into account household composition in terms of sex and age. The results are presented in Table 6.6. Regardless of geographical location, there was growth in consumption between 1992 and 2006. In other words, growth in consumption was broad based although uneven growth is observed. The Northern region registered the least growth, though not surprising given the insecurity that continues to affect the livelihood of the population. However, the picture changes by focusing on the recent two household surveys. Mixed results do emerge, with urban areas registering a negative growth driven by a drop in mean consumption in Northern and Central regions.

Table 6.6: Mean Consumption Expenditure per Adult Equivalent

Residence	Mean (Shs.)			Annualized growth rate (%)	
	1992/93	2002/03	2005/06	1992-2006	2002-2006
Rural/Urban					
Rural	21,200	29,500	33,900	3.6	4.6
Urban	43,200	74,800	71,800	3.9	-1.4
Region					
Central	31,200	52,700	57,600	4.7	3.0
Eastern	21,500	28,500	32,300	3.1	4.2
North	18,200	21,600	22,600	1.7	1.5
Western	22,700	33,800	39,900	4.3	5.5
Central rural	24,100	38,400	45,300	4.8	5.5
Central urban	51,200	91,200	87,200	4.1	-1.5
Eastern rural	20,600	26,200	30,000	2.9	4.5
Eastern urban	30,400	55,100	59,300	5.1	2.4
Northern rural	17,600	20,200	20,500	1.2	0.5
Northern urban	26,900	37,600	35,100	2.0	-2.3
Western rural	21,900	31,500	37,400	4.1	5.7
Western urban	36,300	58,000	69,900	5.0	6.2
National	23,924	35,736	39,746	3.9	3.5

6.2.3 Share of Household Expenditure by Item Group

The above analysis is extended further to examine the trends in the share of each item group in the total household expenditure including non-consumption expenditures prior to the presentation and discussion of the poverty estimates. The results are presented in Table 6.7. The share of food, drinks and tobacco in total household expenditure increased by 1 percentage point, from 44 percent in 2002/03 to 45 percent in 2005/06. Its share remains the highest; followed by expenditure on rent, fuel and power

45% of the household expenditure was on food, beverage & tobacco

at 16 percent. The slight increase in the share of food, drink and tobacco is driven by urban areas. The share remains at 50 percent in rural areas. Worth noting is the observed increase of about 3 percentage points in the share of education; and a 3 percentage point rise for the share of health expenditures in overall total household expenditures³⁰. The increase in education share was more pronounced in urban areas whereas rural areas registered a higher increase in the share of health.

Table 6.7: Share of Household Expenditure by Item Groups (%)

Item Group	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Food, drink & tobacco	50	33	44	50	34	45
Clothing & footwear	4	5	4	4	4	4
Rent, fuel & energy	17	23	19	15	20	16
Household & personal goods	7	7	7	5	6	5
Transport & communication	6	12	8	6	10	7
Education	6	10	7	8	13	10
Health	5	3	4	8	4	7
Other consumption expenditure	2	3	2	2	4	3
Non-consumption expenditure	3	5	3	3	5	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

At regional level, the results in Table 6.8 suggest that the share of food, beverages and tobacco remained unchanged. The only exception is the Northern region where it declined by 2 percentage points and Kampala where it increased by 2 percentage points. The changes in the share of education and health mirror the changes observed at the national level. The observed increase in the share of health in rural areas (Table 6.7) is driven by rural areas in Eastern and Western regions. In the former, it increased by 2 percentage points and in the latter by 5 percentage points. On the other hand, the observed increase in the share of education (Table 6.7) is driven by increases in urban areas in Western and Northern regions of 4 percentage points.

The Northern region had the highest expenditure on food

³⁰ Total private expenditure on education increased from Shs. 51.9bn in 2002/03 to Shs. 81.7bn in 2005/06; whereas private expenditures of health increased from Shs. 29.3bn in 2002/03 to Shs. 53.8bn in 2005/06, in real terms (1997/98=100).

Table 6.8: Regional Share of Expenditure, Urban and Rural, by Item Groups (%)

	Central*			Eastern			Northern			Western			Kampala
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	
2005/06													
Food, drink & tobacco	45	36	43	53	37	50	56	41	52	50	36	48	32
Clothing & footwear	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Rent, fuel & energy	16	18	17	14	17	15	17	18	17	13	17	14	22
Household & personal goods	5	6	5	5	6	5	7	7	7	5	7	5	5
Transport & communication	7	9	8	5	11	6	3	8	4	5	11	6	10
Education	9	13	10	8	14	9	5	12	7	8	13	9	13
Health	7	4	6	7	4	7	6	6	6	10	5	9	4
Other consumption expenditure	3	6	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	4
Non-consumption expenditure	4	6	5	3	5	4	2	4	3	3	5	3	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2002/03													
Food, drink & tobacco	45	33	43	51	41	50	56	43	54	51	38	48	30
Clothing & footwear	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5
Rent, fuel & energy	19	26	21	17	18	17	16	19	17	16	21	17	25
Household & personal goods	7	8	7	6	7	6	8	8	8	8	10	8	6
Transport & communication	8	9	8	6	9	7	4	8	4	6	10	7	15
Education	7	11	8	6	11	7	5	8	5	7	9	7	9
Health	5	3	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	2
Other consumption expenditure	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	4
Non-consumption expenditure	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Poverty trend estimates focused on the cost of meeting calorie needs and some allowance for non-food needs

6.3 Poverty Trend Estimates

The absolute poverty line defined in Appleton (2001), obtained after applying the method of Ravallion and Bidani (1994) to data from the first Monitoring Survey of 1993 has been used. This method focused on the cost of meeting calorie needs, given the food basket of the poorest half of the population and some allowance for non-food needs. It should be noted that there is a strong element of judgment and discretion when setting a poverty line. Consequently, too much attention should not be given to the numerical value of any single poverty statistic. Instead the interest is in comparisons of poverty estimates, whether overtime or across different groups. The poverty line was revalued into 1997/98 prices using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and compared with the adjusted household consumption data discussed earlier.

Table 6.9 (a) and Table 6.10 (b) respectively report poverty statistics for the 2005/06 survey, 2002/03 survey, and the earlier estimates for the 1992/93 (IHS) survey. Three poverty indicators: namely P0, P1 and P2 (see Foster, Greer and Thorbecke, 1984) are reported. The P0 indicator is “headcount”: the percentage of individuals estimated to be living in households with real private consumption per adult equivalent below the poverty line for their rural or urban sub-region. Thus the P0 value implies the percentage of Ugandans estimated to live in households which spend less than what is necessary to meet their calorie requirements and to afford them a mark-up for non-food needs. The headcount shows how *broad* poverty is, although not necessarily how *deep*. That is to say, we do not know how far below the poverty line, the poor are. For this information we use the P1 or P2 indicators.

The P1 indicator is the “poverty gap”. This is the sum over all individuals of the shortfall of their real private consumption per adult equivalent from the poverty line, divided by the poverty line. One way to interpret the P1 is that it gives the per capita cost of eradicating poverty, as a percentage of the poverty line, if money could be targeted perfectly. Thus if P1 is 9, then in an ideal world, it would cost 9 percent of the poverty line per Ugandan in order to eradicate poverty through selective transfers. In practice, it is impossible to target the poor perfectly and issues such as administrative costs and incentive effects have to be considered. The P1 measure gives an idea of the depth of poverty. However, it is limited because it is insensitive to how consumption is distributed among the poor. For example, if a policy resulted in money transfer from someone just below the poverty line to the poorest person, the P1 will not reflect this. To satisfy this condition, we need the P2 measure.

The P2 indicator is the “squared poverty gap”. This is the sum over all individuals of the *square* of the shortfall of their real private consumption per adult equivalent and the poverty line divided by the poverty line. The reason to square the shortfall

is to give greater weight to those who are living far below the line. In brief, whereas P0 measures how widespread poverty is, P1 measures how poor the poor are and, by giving more weight to the poorest of the, P2 gives an indication of how severe poverty is.

Data are disaggregated by location, residence and regions. Along with the poverty statistics, the percentage of people in each location, their mean household consumption per adult equivalent and the contribution each location makes to each poverty statistic (i.e. what percentage of national poverty is attributable to each location) are reported. Given that poverty statistics are estimates, it is useful to test whether changes in their values are statistically significant (Kakwani, 1990). We report t-tests of the significance of the changes in the poverty statistics between 2002/03 and the 2005/06 in Table 6.11. In addition, Table A 2 presents detailed information on sampling error and confidence intervals for the headcount index estimates; and effect of measurement error on our poverty estimates in Table A 3.

Using the full sample of 2005/06, 31.1 percent of Ugandans are estimated to be poor, corresponding to nearly 8.4 million persons. Table 6.9 provides more detailed statistics, broken down by region and rural-urban areas. However, excluding districts not covered in UNHS 1999/00, the headcount stands at 29 percent.

Nearly 8.4 million
Ugandans lived in
poverty in 2005/06

Table 6.9: Poverty Statistics in the UNHS 2005/06

Residence	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	84.6	33,900	34.2	9.7	3.9	93.2	93.8	94.1
Urban	15.4	71,800	13.7	3.5	1.4	6.8	6.2	5.9
Region								
Central	29.2	57,600	16.4	3.6	1.3	15.4	12.1	10.7
Eastern	25.2	32,300	35.9	9.1	3.4	29.0	26.1	24.6
Northern	19.7	22,600	60.7	20.7	9.2	38.5	46.8	51.3
Western	25.9	39,900	20.5	5.1	1.8	17.0	15.1	13.4
Central rural	20.6	45,300	20.9	4.7	1.6	13.9	11.0	9.6
Central urban	8.6	87,200	5.5	1.1	0.5	1.5	1.1	1.1
Eastern rural	23.2	30,000	37.5	9.5	3.6	28.0	25.1	23.8
Eastern urban	2.0	59,300	16.9	4.4	1.5	1.1	1.0	0.9
Northern rural	16.9	20,500	64.2	22.3	9.9	34.9	43.1	47.7
Northern urban	2.8	35,100	39.7	11.5	4.5	3.6	3.7	3.6
Western rural	23.9	37,400	21.4	5.4	1.9	16.5	14.6	13.1
Western urban	2.0	69,900	9.3	2.0	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.3

National	100.0	39,746	31.1	8.7	3.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
-----------------	--------------	---------------	-------------	------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

To evaluate poverty trends, the results of the UNHS 2005/06 were compared with those of UNHS 2002/03 and estimates from IHS. The comparisons are for the entire country. As previously mentioned, the UNHS 1999/00 survey data point was omitted from this trend comparison as the survey did not cover Kitgum, Gulu, Bundibugyo and Kasese due to insurgences at the time of the survey. However, poverty estimates based on 2005/06 excluding these districts are presented in Table A 1.

The results in Table 6.9 & Table 6.10 (a) revealed that the percentage of the people living in absolute poverty declined by 7.8 percentage points, corresponding to a reduction of 1.4 million persons in absolute terms. This decline is statistically significant. The other poverty indicators (P1 and P2 measures) follow a similar trend as the headcount index and the changes are statistically significant (Table 6.11).

Table 6.10: (a) Poverty in the UNHS 2002/03

Residence	Pop.	Mean	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
	Share	CPAE	P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	86.2	29,500	42.7	13.1	5.7	94.9	95.5	95.7
Urban	13.8	74,800	14.4	3.9	1.6	5.1	4.5	4.3
Region								
Central	29.6	52,700	22.3	5.5	1.9	17.0	13.7	11.3
Eastern	27.4	28,500	46.0	14.1	6.0	32.5	32.6	32.0
Northern	18.2	21,600	63.0	23.4	11.5	29.6	36.0	40.9
Western	24.7	33,800	32.9	8.5	3.3	21.0	17.7	15.8
Central rural	21.6	38,400	27.6	6.9	2.5	15.4	12.6	10.5
Central urban	8.0	91,200	7.8	1.6	0.5	1.6	1.1	0.7
Eastern rural	25.3	26,200	48.3	14.9	6.3	31.5	31.7	31.1
Eastern urban	2.1	55,100	17.9	4.8	2.1	1.0	0.9	0.9
Northern rural	16.8	20,200	65.0	24.3	11.9	28.1	34.3	39.1
Northern urban	1.4	37,600	38.9	13.9	6.6	1.5	1.7	1.9
Western rural	22.6	31,500	34.3	8.9	3.4	19.9	16.9	15.0
Western urban	2.2	58,000	18.6	4.8	1.9	1.0	0.9	0.8
National	100.0	35,736	38.8	11.9	5.1	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.10: (b) Poverty in the IHS, 1992/93

Residence	Pop. Share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	87.6	21,200	60.3	22.6	11.2	93.7	94.8	95.5
Urban	12.4	43,200	28.8	8.7	3.7	6.3	5.2	4.5
Region								
Central	28.7	31,200	45.6	15.3	7.0	23.2	21.0	19.6
Eastern	26.1	21,500	58.8	22.0	10.9	27.2	27.5	27.5
Northern	20.0	18,200	73.5	30.3	15.8	26.1	29.0	30.8
Western	25.2	22,700	52.7	18.7	9.0	23.5	22.5	22.0
Central rural	21.2	24,100	54.3	18.7	8.8	20.4	18.9	18.1
Central urban	7.5	51,200	20.8	5.7	2.2	2.7	2.0	1.6
Eastern rural	23.8	20,600	60.6	23.0	11.4	25.5	26.1	26.3
Eastern urban	2.4	30,400	40.4	12.6	5.5	1.7	1.4	1.3
Northern rural	18.8	17,600	75.0	31.0	16.2	25.0	27.9	29.7
Northern urban	1.2	26,900	50.2	19.3	9.8	1.1	1.1	1.2
Western rural	23.8	21,900	53.8	19.2	9.3	22.7	21.9	21.5
Western urban	1.4	36,300	33.2	9.1	3.8	0.8	0.6	0.5
National	100.0	23,924	56.4	20.9	10.3	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.11: T-test Statistics for Hypothesis of Equality of Poverty Statistics in 2002/03 and 2005/06

Residence	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban			
Rural	-7.50	-7.90	-7.20
Urban	-0.43	-0.78	-0.96
Region			
Central	-3.55	-4.10	-3.09
Eastern	-5.06	-6.60	-5.95
Northern	-1.05	-2.47	-3.30
Western	-6.74	-5.59	-4.70
Central rural	-3.16	-3.81	-3.11
Central urban	-1.21	-1.07	-0.07
Eastern rural	-5.07	-6.60	-5.88
Eastern urban	-0.32	-0.47	-1.08
Northern rural	-0.37	-1.67	-2.55
Northern urban	0.16	-1.27	-1.76
Western rural	-6.45	-5.31	-4.43
Western urban	-3.78	-4.21	-4.12
National	-7.65	-8.12	-7.43

The proportion of the poor population reduced from 39% to 31%

Thus, the main finding is that, the incidence of income poverty declined significantly between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06 for Uganda as a whole, whichever poverty indicator (P0, P1 or P2) is used. The percentage of the population living below the poverty line declined from 38.8 percent to 31.1 percent between the two surveys.

Proportionate decrease in poverty was higher in rural areas

At national level, poverty remained the same in urban areas. However, a significant decline is observed in rural areas between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06. The percentage of people in poverty declined from 42.7 percent to 34.2 percent, corresponding to a decline in the number of rural people in poverty from 9.3 million to 7.9 million in rural areas. In urban areas, the corresponding decline was from 14.4 percent to 13.7 percent, recording a slight increase in the absolute number of the poor from 0.5 million to 0.6 million. Other income poverty estimates (P1, P2) mirror similar trend as observed in P0. For example, the P1 indicator which is related to the cost of eliminating urban poverty using transfers decreased faster in rural areas by nearly 25 percent (from 13.1 to 9.7) compared to the 10 percent in urban areas (from 3.9 to 3.5).

The decrease in poverty between the surveys is most marked in the Western region – where the headcount declined from 32.9 percent to 20.5 percent (that is, from 2.1 million to 1.4 million persons in poverty, respectively). In relative terms, this suggests 12.4 percentage points drop in the poverty headcount well above the nation-wide average of 7.8 percentage points. This reduction is driven by trends in the western rural areas from 34.3 percent to 21.4 percent. The proportion of people in poverty in Eastern region declined from 46 percent to 35.9 percent (that is, from 3.2 million to 2.5 million persons, respectively). The decline in Eastern region is driven by the rural areas, which experienced a 10.8 percentage point drop. In Central region, the decline in the headcount (P0) indicator from 22.3 percent to 16.4 percent is statistically significant at conventional levels. The Northern region registered a slight and insignificant fall in the headcount from 63 percent to 60.7 percent. In absolute numbers, the persons living in poverty increases from 2.9 million in 2002/03 to 3.3 million in 2005/06. While the regional rankings of P1 and P2 are identical to the headcount index, there are some differences in the magnitudes. A case in point is the proportionately growing difference in the poverty gap index between Northern region and other regions (especially Eastern and Western regions).

Furthermore, while no significant reduction in the headcount index was observed for Northern Uganda, the region experienced a significant drop in the poverty gap (by about 12 percent). This can be explained partly by the various humanitarian interventions and other government interventions such as the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF). Strong growth in consumption in other regions explains the declines in the poverty gap. One noticeable point is how much the

poverty gap has reduced vis-à-vis the headcount index over the two year period. Regardless of geographical location, we find that the percentage drop in poverty gap is higher than that of the headcount index, indicative of rising mean consumption of Uganda's poor.

Between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06, poverty headcount in Uganda fell by nearly 8 percentage points. There is need to investigate the robustness of this drastic drop over a three year period. This is done by drawing on the theory of stochastic dominance. Each point on a stochastic dominance curve gives the proportion of the population consuming less than the amount given on the horizontal line. Figure 1 shows that for every possible choice of poverty line, the poverty rate in 2005/06 is below that of 2002/03. Hence, there is first order stochastic dominance. The precise choice of the poverty line is unimportant because no matter what poverty line is chosen, we still conclude that poverty fell between the two surveys. Similar conclusions are reached for both rural and urban areas (Figure 2 and Figure 3).

Figure 6.1: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Uganda




Figure 6.2: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Rural





Figure 6.3: Poverty Incidence Curve for 2002/03 and 2005/06, Urban



6.3.1 Changes in the Distribution of Income

For Uganda as a whole, the mean of this welfare measure increased from Shs 35,736 per month in 2002/03 survey to Shs 39,746 per month in 2005/06 survey; equivalent to an annualized growth rate of 3.5 percent. Table 6.12 reports real consumption per adult equivalent at the median and other deciles. At the median, the welfare measure increased from Shs. 24,737 to Shs. 28,532, corresponding to

an annualized growth rate of 4.8 percent. In other words, welfare increased both at the mean and median, although the increase was stronger at the median than at the mean. Increases in welfare between the surveys are also recorded for all other deciles, except for the more affluent (the 9th decile, the lower bounds of the top 10 percent, most affluent Ugandans) in urban areas. Thus it appears that growth between 2002/03 and 2005/06 surveys benefited the masses. These national trends do appear to be driven by rural-urban differences.

Table 6.12: Consumption per Adult Equivalent at Each Decile (1997/98=100)

	Decile	IHS	UNHS 2002/03	UNHS 2005/06
National				
	1	8,518	11,696	13,116
	2	11,168	15,024	17,029
	3	13,691	18,143	20,471
	4	16,220	21,303	24,297
	5	18,996	24,737	28,532
	6	22,106	29,037	33,611
	7	26,374	34,448	40,795
	8	32,009	44,059	52,285
	9	42,780	64,322	73,878
Rural				
	Decile	IHS	UNHS 2002/03	UNHS 2005/06
	1	8,194	11,160	12,597
	2	10,674	14,311	16,243
	3	13,001	17,163	19,503
	4	15,319	19,970	22,787
	5	17,870	23,011	26,435
	6	20,632	26,569	30,645
	7	24,353	30,895	36,075
	8	29,040	37,499	44,738
	9	36,942	52,079	60,492
Urban				
	Decile	IHS	UNHS 2002/03	UNHS 2005/06
	1	14,176	19,469	19,609
	2	18,661	26,316	27,030
	3	22,917	32,912	33,784
	4	27,852	39,891	42,119
	5	32,869	47,728	52,021
	6	38,400	57,033	62,148
	7	46,601	69,631	77,175
	8	55,898	90,716	97,744
	9	76,974	141,933	141,457

6.3.2 Inequality in Household Consumption

Table 6.13 reports the Gini coefficients as a measure of inequality in household consumption per adult equivalent. Between 2002/03 survey and 2005/06 survey, the Gini coefficient dropped, and hence inequality declined. The lower deciles registered higher rises in living standards than the more affluent. The observed decrease was driven by a decline in inequality of income in urban areas. Income inequality remained the same in rural areas between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06.

Nationally, on average, income inequality decreases from 0.428 to 0.408

Table 6.13: Gini Coefficients for Uganda

Residence	1992/93	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban			
Urban	0.396	0.483	0.432
Rural	0.328	0.363	0.363
Region			
Central	0.395	0.460	0.417
Eastern	0.327	0.365	0.354
Northern	0.345	0.350	0.331
Western	0.319	0.359	0.342
National	0.365	0.428	0.408

Since the distribution of income became less unequal between 2002/03 and 2005/06 surveys, and growth in consumption was positive and strong, it is not surprising that poverty declined during the period. Consider, for example, the 7.8 point drop in the poverty headcount from 38.8 percent in 2002/03 to 31.1 percent in 2005/06. Applying the decomposition of Datt and Ravallion (1991), it was found that the growth in mean consumption should have reduced the percentage living in poverty by 6.6 percentage points (i.e. assuming the distribution of consumption remained as in 2002/03). However, changes in the distribution of welfare were progressive, implying a 1.2 percentage point drop in poverty (the Datt-Ravallion decomposition is not exact, but in this case, the residual is essentially zero).

Table 6.14 presents the decomposition of income inequality between and within social groups. There is rising income inequality between regions but falling between rural-urban divide and between educational attainment levels. One noticeable point is the rising income inequality within regional sub-groupings.

Table 6.14: Decomposition of Income Inequality (%)

Sub-grouping		1992/93	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban	Between	14.6	20.7	15.6
	Within	85.4	79.3	84.4
Regions	Between	8.7	17.0	19.6
	Within	91.3	83.0	80.4
Educational attainment in levels	Between	14.6	27.3	25.4
	Within	85.4	72.7	74.6

Whether households are poor in monetary terms depends on their incomes. Hence, to understand poverty, an attempt is made to look at what has been happening to people's incomes. Table 6.15 and Table 6.16 provide a disaggregation of poverty indicators for the 2002/03 and 2005/06 surveys

respectively, based on the main industry in which the household head works³¹. Poverty declined markedly amongst crop farming households, with the headcount declining from 48.9 percent to 36.8 percent. But the weighted proportion of the sample in crop farming households increased from 45.2 percent to 53.1 percent during the past 7 days prior to the interview. In other words, more household heads reported their main activity as being crop farming, reflecting movement of labor into farming. Nevertheless, the concentration of poor persons in Uganda remains in crop agriculture. The results further reveal that the percentage of Ugandans living on incomes below the minimum required to meet the basic needs dropped in all the other sectors too.

Table 6.15: Poverty by Sector of Household Head, 2005/06

Sector	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Crop agriculture	53.1	30,400	36.8	10.2	4.1	62.9	62.0	61.2
Non-crop agriculture	4.9	38,500	28.1	7.7	3.0	4.5	4.3	4.2
Construction & mining	2.0	40,700	27.1	7.1	2.3	1.7	1.6	1.3
Manufacturing	4.7	51,900	21.8	5.2	2.0	3.3	2.8	2.7
Trade	9.1	55,700	14.9	4.0	1.5	4.3	4.1	3.8
Transport & comm.	2.5	52,000	16.7	3.6	1.1	1.3	1.0	0.8
Public services	5.0	75,100	8.5	1.0	0.2	1.4	0.6	0.3
Other services	3.7	62,800	17.9	5.5	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.5
Inactive	5.8	41,600	37.2	12.5	5.7	6.9	8.3	9.3
Off-temp	9.2	39,200	39.0	12.2	5.3	11.6	12.9	13.9

Table 6.16: Poverty by Sector of Household Head, 2002/03

Sector	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Crop agriculture	45.2	26,000	48.9	14.7	6.2	56.9	55.9	54.5
Non-crop agriculture	5.1	36,700	32.5	9.7	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.9
Construction & mining	2.2	37,100	33.0	10.8	4.8	1.9	2.0	2.1
Manufacturing	7.2	36,100	31.0	8.8	3.3	5.8	5.4	4.7
Trade	14.2	45,800	20.5	5.1	1.9	7.5	6.2	5.2
Transport & comm.	2.6	52,900	19.8	4.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	0.6
Public services	5.4	67,300	13.7	3.5	1.4	1.9	1.6	1.5
Other services	4.6	58,700	26.4	7.4	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Inactive	4.9	37,800	43.1	16.8	8.7	5.4	6.9	8.3

³¹ Unlike in the previous household surveys, no information was collected on the main activity status during the past 12 months prior to the interview. Instead, such information was gathered for the last 7 days prior to the interview.

Off-temp	8.6	30,100	53.9	19.3	9.7	12.0	14.0	16.3
----------	-----	--------	------	------	-----	------	------	------

An alternative disaggregation of the poverty estimates is by employment status of the household head (Table 6.17). This revealed improvements in the living standard of all categories, except for those whose head is involved in other unspecified activities. Worth noting is the increased share of private employment accompanied by a reduction in the poverty headcount. This is contrary to what we observed between UNHS 1999/00 and UNHS 2002/03, where both population share and headcount index rose.

Table 6.17: Poverty by Employment Status of Household Head

	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
2005/06								
Self employment	79.7	35,500	33.6	9.5	3.8	86.1	86.5	86.7
Government employment	4.7	76,700	7.2	0.9	0.2	1.1	0.5	0.2
Private employment	11.9	50,200	24.0	6.7	2.7	9.2	9.1	8.9
Others	2.4	38,200	36.2	12.3	5.4	2.9	3.4	3.8
Inactive	1.3	72,800	19.2	3.3	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4
2002/03								
Self employment	79.4	33,100	40.4	12.1	5.1	82.6	80.9	79.2
Government employment	4.9	67,000	16.2	4.0	1.5	2.1	1.7	1.4
Private employment	9.9	41,600	35.3	11.2	5.0	9.0	9.4	9.6
Others	1.1	45,400	31.7	10.4	4.7	0.9	0.9	1.0
Inactive	4.7	33,200	44.5	17.9	9.5	5.4	7.1	8.7

Notes: Employment status refers to the past 12 months prior to the interview

Both UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06 captured information on what the households themselves considered as the most important source of income during the past 12 months prior to interview. The results by poverty status are presented in Table 6.18. Between the two surveys, the share of households reporting agriculture as the most important source of income increased from 41.8 percent in 2002/03 to 51.5 percent in 2005/06. However, this increase did not translate into worsening living standards. Instead, the incidence of poverty declined from 48.2 percent to 31.5 percent. The share of Ugandans reporting cash transfers (remittances) increased and at the same time they registered a reduction in the headcount index.

Table 6.18: Poverty by Most Important Source of Income to Household

	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
2005/06								
Agriculture	51.5	33,000	31.5	8.3	3.2	61.1	59.0	56.9
Wage employment	20.7	65,500	18.0	4.8	1.8	14.0	13.6	13.2
Non-agric. enter	18.8	61,100	16.0	4.1	1.6	11.4	10.6	10.7
Transfers	4.8	68,900	16.0	4.0	1.5	2.9	2.6	2.5
Others	4.2	29,100	66.3	24.6	11.5	10.5	14.2	16.8
2002/03								
Agriculture	41.8	25,900	48.2	14.5	6.1	51.9	51.0	49.8
Wage employment	14.2	46,900	34.3	10.9	4.7	12.6	13.1	13.2
Self-employment	37.9	40,700	32.2	9.9	4.3	31.4	31.8	32.3
Transfers	4.4	47,200	29.1	8.8	4.2	3.3	3.3	3.6
Others	1.7	44,300	19.3	6.8	3.4	0.8	0.9	1.1

Notes: i) Self employment in 2002/03 and non-agricultural enterprises in 2005/06 need to be interpreted with caution.

ii) Analysis done at household level.

6.4 Summary of Findings

The 2005/06 survey showed strong growth in per household, per capita and per adult equivalent expenditure, especially in rural areas. But growth in consumption was marked by uneven progress. In addition, food, beverages and tobacco still dominate the household budget. The results presented in this chapter show a significant increase in the share of education and health in the overall household expenditures.

Data on private consumption from the 2002/03 and 2005/06 surveys imply strong growth between the two periods. Nevertheless, the growth was slightly lower than that observed between 1997 and 1999/00 surveys. It is also worth noting that growth in private consumption based on the national accounts for this period is lower than the growth estimate from the household surveys.

The growth between the two recent surveys seems to have benefited the majority of Ugandans. For the median Ugandan, the welfare has improved. And this is also true for other deciles. As a result, the proportion of people living in poverty has declined and so has, in absolute terms, the number of poor persons. Thus, the fight against poverty (in percentages and in numbers) realized significant outcomes within the three year period between 2002/03 and 2005/06. And the reduction was statistically significant and robust. The reduction in poverty is particularly marked for some sub-groups of the population – including rural areas as a whole and those residing in Eastern and Western regions. While the proportion of urban poor remained roughly constant, the number of urban poor increased by 0.1 million

between the two surveys. Over the entire period, the poverty headcount index changed little in Northern Uganda. However, the slight drop was not enough to prevent a rise in the number of persons living in poverty in the region. One noticeable improvement was a significant drop in the poverty gap index between UNHS 2002/03 and UNHS 2005/06, indicating that the poor in 2005/06 were not as poor as their counterpart in 2002/03.

While rural areas experienced very strong growth in mean consumption levels, the urban areas experienced strong reduction in inequality of income. Overall, the findings indicate significant improvements in living standards and in distribution of income, but marked spatial unevenness in the improvements.

Finally, the results suggest that the reduction in poverty in rural areas contributed to the overall reduction observed at the national level. In this chapter, we do not attempt to explain the welfare changes that have occurred over time, although we can suggest that one of the factors underlying the improvements could have been the recovery of coffee prices from an average of \$0.56 per kg in 2002/03 to \$1.38 per kg in 2005/06. Accordingly, there is need to conduct a more detailed investigation into what might have happened to sources of income, particularly among the rural population.

CHAPTER SEVEN

HOUSEHOLD INCOME, LOANS AND CREDIT

7.0 Introduction

The PEAP aims at contributing towards transforming Uganda into a middle-income country. In order to become a middle-income country, the structure of Uganda's economy must be transformed through wealth accumulation, increasing production and taking advantage of the country's overall dynamic comparative advantage³².

Currently, most households derive much of their income from subsistence agriculture, but many households are moving into production for the market and self-employment outside agriculture in an attempt to enhance their income. Actions to promote production, competitiveness and incomes are guided by the policy frameworks of Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA), Medium Term Competitiveness Strategy (MTCS) and the Strategic Exports Programme (SEP).

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on various components of household income including income from household enterprises, wages and salaries and current transfers and other benefits (which include remittances).

This chapter presents descriptive statistics relating to gross household income as an aggregate of selected components which include; income from agricultural activities, income from non-agricultural activities, income from wage and salaries and income from transfer earnings. For purposes of the analysis, household income was defined as the sum of income both in cash and in-kind³³ that accrues from economic activities performed by household members on a regular basis. The nominal value of income was used implying that it has not been adjusted for inflation or decreasing purchasing power.

7.1 Income of Household Members

7.1.2 Monthly per Household Income

The overall average monthly per household income was Shs. 170,891 in 2005/06 as seen in Table 7.1. It was generally lower in rural areas as compared to urban areas.

Average monthly
per household
income was Shs.
170.891

³² PEAP 2004-2007, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

³³ Income in form of goods and services rather than cash.

Regionally, Kampala district registered the highest monthly per household income of Shs. 347,918 while the central region (excluding Kampala district) super ceded other regions with per household monthly income of Shs.209,369. The Northern region registered the lowest average monthly per household income of Shs. 93,401 during the same period.

Table 7.1: Average Monthly per Household Income by Residence

Residence	2005/06		Uganda
	Rural	Urban	
Kampala	-	347,918	347,918
Central	192,655	320,202	209,369
Eastern	144,116	261,749	155,510
Northern	76,232	209,036	93,401
Western	144,244	313,150	159,152
Uganda	142,778	306,278	170,891

7.2 Household Income Classes

To the extent possible, income distribution is considered within the context of income class differentials. Table 7.2 shows the percentage distribution of households by five income classes. Overall, the proportion of households in the lowest income group was twice (41%) that of households in the highest income group (20%). The proportion of households in the lowest income class in rural areas (45 %) was more than double that in urban areas (21%). The reverse was true for households in the highest income class, with a higher proportion in urban areas (37%) than in rural areas (17%).

Table 7.2 further shows that across regions, Northern region had the biggest proportion of households in the low income class (55%), and the lowest proportion of households in the highest income class (10%). Kampala district had about half of the households in the top two income classes.

41% of households were in the lowest income group

Table 7.2: Percentage distribution of households by Income class and Residence (%)

Residence	Income Class ('000 Shs)					Total
	0-50	>50-100	>100-150	>150-200	>200	
Rural/Urban	Percentage					
Urban	20.9	19.0	12.9	10.7	36.5	100.0
Rural	45.0	22.1	9.7	6.5	16.8	100.0
Region						
Kampala	15.6	16.8	14.3	11.6	41.8	100.0
Central	30.9	22.2	11.6	7.8	27.5	100.0
Eastern	45.0	20.0	10.2	8.1	16.7	100.0
Northern	54.5	22.5	7.6	5.3	10.2	100.0
Western	42.9	22.8	10.0	6.1	18.2	100.0
Uganda	40.8	21.5	10.3	7.2	20.2	100.0

7.3 Main Source of Household Earnings

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the households' major source of earnings during the period of 12 months prior to the date of the survey. Results in Table 7.3 show that about half of the households in Uganda depended on subsistence farming as their major source of earnings. The proportion was higher in rural areas (58 %) compared to urban areas (10%).

Table 7.3: Major Source of Household Earnings by Residence (%)

	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Subsistence farming	57.8	9.7	49.2
Commercial farming	2.9	1.5	2.7
Wage employment	16.4	41.2	20.8
Non-agricultural enterprises	14.9	37.3	19
Transfers	4.3	7.7	4.9
Others	3.7	1.5	3.5

The results in Table 7.3 further indicate that in Uganda, one fifth of the households had wage employment as the major source of earnings. The proportion was far much higher in urban households (41%), compared to rural households (16%).

An almost equal proportion of one fifth of the households mainly got their income from non-agricultural enterprises. The proportion in urban areas (37%) was more than double of that in rural areas (15%). Only 5 percent of the households mainly

Subsistence Farming is still the major source of household earnings

got their income from transfers while a paltry 3 percent of the households had commercial farming as their main source of income. The findings reinforce the PEAP recommendation that Uganda's strategy for poverty reduction should combine increased agricultural incomes from smallholder farming with increased opportunities for wage employment coming from the growth of formal enterprises in agriculture, industry and services.

7.3.1 Main Source of Earnings by Region

Table 7.4 shows that the eastern region had the highest proportion of households (61%) with subsistence farming as the main source of income, followed by western region with 59 percent. Almost 83 percent of the households in Kampala district had their main income from either wage employment or non-agricultural enterprises.

61% of households in the Eastern region depended on subsistence farming as the main source of income.

Thirteen percent of the households in the northern region had transfers as the main source of earnings probably because of the activities of many relief organizations in the region.

Table 7.4: Major Source of Household Earnings by Regions (%)

	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western
Subsistence farming	2.3	40.9	60.5	50.9	58.8
Commercial farming	1.8	3.3	2.4	1.3	3.5
Wage employment	46.8	23.4	16.2	15.4	21
Non-agricultural enterprises	36	25.9	14.1	15.4	13.9
Transfers	9.7	5.5	6.5	13.2	2.1
Others	3.4	1	0.3	3.8	0.7

7.4 Income and Characteristics of Households

There is a strong correlation between household income and some household characteristics such as gender, sector of employment and education attainment of the household head among others.

7.4.1 Income by Sector of Employment

Table 7.5 shows the relationship between income and sector of employment of the household head. Three sectors were considered namely: primary, manufacturing and the service sector. The primary sector encompasses all activities such as farming, horticulture and mining relating to extraction or harvesting natural resources while the manufacturing/secondary sector of industry generally takes the output of the primary sector and transforms it into finished goods or products suitable for use by other businesses, for export, or sale to domestic consumers. The service/ tertiary sector provide services, such as retail and wholesale operations, insurance.

Households whose head was employed in the service sector had highest average income

Table 7.5 further shows that overall, average monthly per household income was highest in households whose heads are employed in the service sector followed by the manufacturing sector and lastly the primary sector. However in the rural areas, the reverse was observed with higher incomes for households headed by a person in the primary sector.

7.4.2 Income and Sex of Household Head

It is important to note that in most African societies, men and women engage in different economic activities, with different implications on their income. Social roles and norms dictate the segregation of activities by gender where women mostly concentrate on farm activities and Care Labour while men undertake income-earning activities because those are largely the roles that society prescribes for them (Ilahi, 2001a; 2001b).

Male headed households had higher monthly household income

Table 7.5 shows that overall; the average monthly income of male-headed households (Shs. 170,300) was higher than that in female headed households (Shs. 106,200). The same pattern followed for urban areas. However it is notable that, in the rural areas, the average monthly household income of female-headed households (Shs. 79,900) more than doubled that for male-headed households (Shs. 37,600). This may be due to the fact that in the rural areas more females are engaged in subsistence agriculture which contributes a considerable share of household income in these areas.

7.4.3 Income by Education Attainment

Households headed by individuals with secondary and post secondary education had the highest average per household monthly income

Investment in education contributes to the accumulation of human capital, which is essential for higher incomes and sustained income growth. Considering how education significantly enhances the earnings potential of individuals, it is not surprising that per household income rose as the educational attainment increased as shown in Table 7.5. Households headed by individuals with secondary and post secondary education had the highest average per household monthly income. This finding was consistent with the urban areas. However, in rural areas, households headed by individuals with some primary education had the highest income.

Table 7.5: Average Monthly Household Income by Residence and Selected Household Characteristics ('000)

Characteristic	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Sector of Employment of Head			
Primary sector	86.2	190.0	90.7
Manufacturing/secondary sector	51.2	293.8	204.5
Service /tertiary sector	68.0	333.0	295.6
Gender of Household Head			
Male headed	37.6	328.2	170.3
Female headed	79.9	213.5	106.2
Education level of Head			
No formal education	47.1	141.4	54.4
Some Primary	94.4	165.0	102.4
Completed P7	25.4	218.9	141.1
Some secondary	92.5	280.4	219.1
Completed S6 / Post secondary	42.0	390.6	308.4

7.5 Loans and Credit

The concern for understanding the characteristics of demand for financial services is becoming more important because of the increasing role placed on micro-credit for investment both in the PEAP and the PMA. On the part of the government, a number of credit programmes targeting the poor have been implemented. Examples of such programmes include the Rural Farmers Scheme (1987), the Poverty Alleviation Project (PAP), Programme for the Alleviation of Poverty and Social Costs of Adjustment (PAPSCA) and *Entandikwa* credit scheme³⁴.

On the side of non-governmental organizations and the private sector, a wide range of Microfinance Institutions (MFIs), self-help savings and credit associations popularly known as 'village banks' have also emerged to respond to this huge gap in the market.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on various issues related to access to and demand for credit from both formal and informal sources. Formal loans include money borrowed from financial institutions with interest, security and conditions for payment well-laid down while informal loans refer to borrowing from friends, relatives, private money-lenders, community associations without any formal agreement describing the terms of payment.

³⁴ Paul Mpuga: Demand for Credit in Rural Uganda, March 2004


7.5.1 Demand for Credit

The factors affecting the demand for financial services can be categorized into two: the individual/household characteristics and the attributes of the financial institutions. At individual/household level these factors include the level of income, sex, age, education and whether or not one has obtained credit before. Among the attributes of the financial institutions that affect an individual's / household's decision to demand financial services from that source are the interest rate, other terms of the credit, and distance from the provider.

Only one in ten households applied for credit.

Figure 7.1 reveals that only one in ten households applied for credit. The proportion of loan applicants was not significantly different between urban areas (11%) and rural areas (10%). Across regions, the northern region had the lowest proportion of loan applicants (4%) while western region had the highest proportion (16%).

Figure 7.1: Loan Applicants by Residence and Region (%)



7.5.2 Sources of Credit

Individuals who reported having applied for a loan were further asked about the source of the loan. Sources were categorized as formal, semiformal and informal. Formal sources included commercial and development banks, while semiformal sources included Microfinance institutions, NGOs and cooperatives. Informal sources comprised Land Lords, Employers, Local groups, relatives, friends and local money lenders.

24% of loan applicants sought credit from informal sources

Table 7.6 shows that the highest proportion of loan applicants (24%) sought credit from informal sources. The widespread use of the informal financial institutions in

Uganda can be attributed to several factors, including the level of income, level of education, distance from the nearest financial facility, security/collateral demanded, minimum balance requirement and flexibility in repayment.

There was a smaller proportion of households in the rural areas who applied for credit from formal and semi-formal sources compared to the urban areas. The reverse was true for informal sources; more households in rural areas (24%) than in urban areas (22%) applied for credit from these sources.

Table 7.6: Households that applied for a Loan by Source, Residence (%)

Residence	Source of loan			Uganda
	Formal	Semi-formal	Informal	
Rural/Urban				
Rural	1.8	4.5	24.4	10.2
Urban	4.9	7.2	21.7	11.3
Region				
Kampala	3.9	5.7	23.4	11.0
Central	1.5	5.3	25.0	10.6
Eastern	2.1	4.7	19.6	8.8
Northern	1.2	3.0	7.6	4.1
Western	3.4	5.9	38.2	15.9
Uganda	2.3	4.9	23.9	10.4

7.5.3 Credit Constraints

A household or individual is credit constrained if: a household/individual applied for a loan and was rejected by a particular lender, or given less than the desired amount; or the household/individual was discouraged from applying for a loan for various reasons³⁵.

Table 7.7 shows that about 23 percent of households did not apply for loans because they did not want to be indebted while 19 percent did not apply due to inadequate collateral. Twenty percent did not apply for a loan because they felt it was not necessary. Those reporting high interest rate and non-availability of credit facilities as a hindrance were only 8 percent and 7 percent respectively.

23% of households did not apply for loans because they did not want to be indebted.

³⁵ This definition has been used by Jappelli (1990), Crook (1996), Cox and Jappelli (1993), Duca and Rosenthal (1993), Japelli, Pischke and Souleles (1998) amongst others.

Table 7.7: Households that did not apply for a Loan by Residence and Reason

Reason	Rural/Urban		Uganda
	Urban	Rural	
Not necessary	24.5	18.9	20.0
Doesn't know where to apply	3.6	6.1	5.2
Lack of sensitization	4.2	6.2	5.9
Facility not available	2.3	8.2	6.7
Lack of collateral	21.1	19.2	19.3
Interest too high	9.2	6.9	7.6
Don't like to be indebted	23.2	21.9	22.8
Possible rejection	10.4	11.4	11.3
Other	1.6	1.3	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

7.5.4 Borrowing and Respondents' Characteristics

It is important to note that demand for financial services is dependent on a number of factors. These include one's economic activity, gender, control of assets and education among others.

The educated are likely to have higher incomes and savings and therefore assets that can act as collateral. Table 7.8 shows that the majority of loan applicants in formal institutions (61%) are those with post secondary education while the semi-formal and informal sources are dominated by persons with only primary education.

Access to and demand for credit may be affected by the main economic activity in which the recipient is involved. One's economic activity usually relates closely with the level of job security and affects the willingness of the lender to approve one's loan application. It is therefore not surprising that the majority of loan recipients from formal sources were permanent employees (58%). This is because permanent employment is recognized as adequate security for one to acquire a loan in many formal money-lending institutions in Uganda. On the other hand the majority of loan applicants from semi-formal and informal sources were self-employed (69%)

61% of loan applicants in formal institutions had post secondary education.

Table 7.8: Loan Applicants by Source of Loan and Selected Characteristics

Background characteristic	Source of loan (%)		
	Formal	Semi-formal	Informal
Education level			
No formal schooling	0.2	4.1	15.1
Primary	16.4	47.5	59.0
Some secondary	15.4	25.9	17.5
Completed S6	6.8	1.4	1.6
Post secondary	61.2	21.1	6.8
Sector of employment			
Primary sector	13.4	40.4	68.7
Manufacturing	5.2	9.1	5.2
Service	79.1	45.3	22.3
Other	2.4	5.2	3.8
Activity			
Self employed	33.5	68.5	69.1
Unpaid family worker	0.7	9.2	8.4
Permanent employee	58.4	11.7	6.5
Temporary/Casual employee	5.9	5.7	12.2
Not stated	1.5	4.9	3.8

7.5.5 Purpose of Loan

Some people borrow for investment with the aim of increasing income while others borrow for consumption smoothing in periods of hardship. The latter ensures maintenance of their consumption levels without running down productive assets.

Table 7.9 shows that the major reason for demanding credit was to purchase inputs and use as working capital (24%). Other reasons included, buying consumption goods (20%), meeting health expenditures (16%), and education expenses (15%) among others. There were no major differences between sexes except that a higher proportion of women took out loans to purchase consumption goods or to pay for education (18% and 23% respectively).

Purchase inputs and use as working capital were the major reason for demand for credit

Table 7.9: Loan Applicants by Purpose of Loan and Sex (%)

Purpose	Sex		Uganda
	Male	Female	
Purchase inputs/working capital	23.8	23.9	23.9
Buy consumption goods	17.8	22.8	19.7
Pay for health expenses	16.8	14.1	15.8
Pay for education expenses	12.9	17.7	14.7
Buy farm tools /inputs	7.4	6.1	6.9
Pay for building materials	5.5	3.7	4.9
Pay for ceremonial expenses	4.0	2.3	3.4
Buy land	3.5	2.7	3.2
Buy livestock	2.3	1.3	1.9
Other	5.9	5.4	5.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0

7.5.6 Collateral

Lack of collateral for the loan hampers the ability for one to borrow. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on type of collateral required of loan applicants from the three main sources of credit.

Table 7.10 shows that collateral in the form of salary and land was a major consideration (30% and 20% respectively) before credit was advanced in the formal financial institutions. On the other hand the majority of those who borrowed from informal sources required either no collateral (63%) or only mutual trust (15%) to take credit.

Table 7.10: Loan Applicants by Type of Collateral and Source of Loan (%)

Collateral Required	Source of loan		
	Formal	Semi-formal	Informal
None	8.8	8.7	63.0
Mutual trust	8.8	5.8	14.9
Land	20.1	22.1	9.5
Group (Peer monitoring)	1.8	16.6	2.6
Livestock	3.9	10.6	2.1
House	10.6	8.2	1.2
Future harvests	1.1	0.5	1.4
Vehicle	2.2	0.9	0.3
Salary/ business proceeds	30.3	17.5	2.4
Other	12.4	9.1	2.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

7.5.7 Loan Repayment Period

Despite the fact that some financial institutions are less rigid in their operations and may not demand for physical collateral against loans, borrowing may still be discouraged by rigidity of these institutions in terms of the requirement for regular repayments of loans, usually at short intervals.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on outstanding loans and loans fully repaid by households during the 12 months prior to the date of the survey. Table 7.11 shows that most applicants to formal sources (55%) were given a repayment period of 1 to 3 years while for semi-formal sources, the majority (89%) had less than a year. Most loan applicants to informal sources (60%) received credit with no fixed term for repayment.

Table 7.11: Loan Applicant by Source and Repayment Period (%)

Repayment Period	Source of loan			Any source
	Formal	Semi-formal	Informal	
Less than 1 year	44.8	89.3	38.7	46.2
1-3 years	54.7	8.8	1.5	5.9
No fixed term	0.5	1.9	59.8	47.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

7.6 Transfer and Other Earnings

In many developing countries remittances now constitute the second largest capital flow after Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). To-date remittances constitute the fastest growing and most stable capital flow to developing countries. Various private sector entities and some countries have implemented new products, incentives and policies to encourage individuals and institutions to shift from informal to formal remittances systems. Unfortunately, apart from Money Gram and Western Union Money Transfer services not much has hitherto been undertaken in Uganda³⁶

It is therefore important that steps be taken to establish the exact inflows on account of workers remittances. Improving the quality of data on remittances flows and migration patterns is therefore a priority for improving our understanding of remittance impacts and elaborating more effective policy action.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on receipt and use of both domestic and international remittances at household level. Table 7.12 disaggregates the proportions of households that received remittances and the median value of these remittances according to the source. Overall the proportion of recipients of remittances from local sources (41%) was much higher than that for remittances from abroad (2%). Across regions the northern region had the highest proportion of recipients of local remittances (56%) while Kampala had the highest proportion of

**41% of household
received remittances
from local sources**

³⁶ Muwanga –Zake ,E.S.K : Transferring funds to Uganda: The current legal ways and issues, September 2004

recipients of remittances from abroad (7%). Also recipients in Kampala received the

highest mean monthly value of remittances both from local sources and abroad (Shs 50,700 and Shs.130, 500 respectively).

By residence, there was a higher proportion of recipients of remittances from local sources in rural areas (42%) while it was the reverse for remittances from abroad with urban areas presenting a higher proportion (5%). Again recipients in urban areas received the highest mean monthly value of remittances both from local sources and abroad (Shs 38,000 and Shs.119, 300 respectively).

Table 7.12: Households that received a Remittance during the last 12 months by Residence (%)

Residence	% households		Mean monthly Value* of amount received	
	From domestic sources	From abroad	From domestic sources	From abroad
Rural/Urban				
Urban	39.6	5.0	38000	119300
Rural	41.8	1.7	14500	39700
Region				
Kampala	35.2	7.3	50700	130500
Central	47.0	2.4	20500	98500
Eastern	41.7	3.3	15600	29500
Northern	56.4	0.9	13700	27700
Western	26.9	0.7	14700	28300
Uganda	41.4	2.3	18500	70500

*Note: Value of remittances includes both cash and in-kind

7.6.1 Purpose of Remittances

Households that reported receipt of remittances were further asked about the purpose for which the money was used. Table 7.13 shows that most recipients used remittances to purchase consumption goods and services irrespective of their source. This was followed by payment for education expenses. It reinforces the findings by Bank of Uganda that the shilling tends to appreciate during the time of paying school fees and Christmas holidays when the immigrant workers send funds to support their families³⁷.

Most recipients used remittances to purchase consumption good and services

³⁷ Muwanga –Zake ,E.S.K : Transferring funds to Uganda: The current legal ways and issues, September 2004

Table 7.13: Recipients by Purpose and Source of Remittances (%)

Main Purpose of Remittances	Source of Remittances	
	Domestic	Abroad
Purchase consumption goods and services	63.4	51.7
Pay for education expenses	13.6	26.1
Pay for health expenses	6.6	2.9
Working capital for non-farm enterprises	0.9	5.7
Purchase building materials	0.5	3.9
Buy land	0.1	1.5
Buy farm inputs, tools and implements	0.6	0.3
Pay for ceremonial expenses	1.1	2.0
Other	13.2	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0

7.7 Summary of Findings

The overall average monthly per household income was Shs. 170,891 in 2005/06 and was highest in households whose heads were employed in the service sector. Also, the average monthly income of male-headed households was higher than that in female headed households. Considering how education significantly enhances the earnings potential of individuals, households headed by individuals with secondary and post secondary education had the highest average per household monthly income. The Northern region registered the lowest average monthly per household income Shs. 93,401 during the same period.

About half of the households mainly got their earnings from subsistence farming. Eastern region had the highest proportion of households with subsistence farming as the main source of income. The findings reinforce the PEAP recommendation that Uganda's strategy for poverty reduction should combine increased agricultural incomes from smallholder farming with increased opportunities for wage employment coming from the growth of formal enterprises in agriculture, industry and services.

Only one in ten households applied for credit. There were fewer households in the rural areas who applied for credit from formal and semi-formal sources compared to the urban areas. The highest proportion of loan applicants (24%) sought credit from informal sources. Across regions, the northern region had the lowest proportion of loan applicants (4%) while western region had the highest proportion (16%). The majority of loan applicants in formal institutions (61%) are those with post secondary education while the semi-formal and informal sources are dominated by persons with only primary education.

About 22 percent of households did not apply for loans because they did not want to be indebted. The major reason for demanding credit was to purchase inputs and use as working capital (24%). Other reasons included, buying consumption goods (20%), meeting health expenditures (16%), and education expenses (15%) among others.

Overall the proportion of recipients of remittances from local sources (41%) was much higher than that for remittances from abroad (2%). Across regions the northern region had the highest proportion of recipients of local remittances (56%) while Kampala had the highest proportion of recipients of remittances from abroad (7%). Recipients in Kampala received the highest mean monthly value of remittances both from local sources and abroad. (Shs 50,700 and Shs.130, 500 respectively). Irrespective of their source most recipients used remittances to purchase consumption goods and services.

CHAPTER EIGHT

WELFARE LEVELS

8.0 Introduction

There are various ways of comparing the characteristics of the poor and the non poor, and one of the ways is by welfare indicators. Welfare questions were designed to provide a set of indicators for monitoring poverty and the effects of development policies, programmes and projects on living standards in the country. The welfare indicators also aim at providing reliable data for monitoring changes in the welfare status of various sub-groups of the population.

Goal 1 of MDGs³⁸ is to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. Sub-Saharan Africa has the highest incidence of poverty. In addition, findings from Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Programme (UPPAP) report and the study on Poverty Correlates indicate that welfare levels significantly affect the well being of the household.

This chapter discusses the welfare indicators as measured by ownership of blankets, clothes and shoes, action taken when household last run out of salt, breakfast for children under five years, average number of meals taken per day, exposure to risk during the last 12 months and participation in local governance (LCI, LCII and LC III).

8.1 Possession of Two Sets of Clothes by Household Member(s)

In this survey, only clothes in good or average condition were considered, (tatters and uniforms both for school and work were excluded). There was need to establish whether every household member had two sets of clothes as a welfare indicator.

Findings in Table 8.1 indicate that 87 percent of the households had all their members having at least two sets of clothes. This indicated an almost similar proportion to that of 2002/03. Apart from Kampala, Central region had the highest proportion of households with members having at least two sets of clothes (94%) followed by the Western region with 90 percent and the Northern region with the least (69%).

87% households had each member with at least two sets of clothes

³⁸ Millennium Development Goals Report of 2005

Table 8.1: Possession of at least Two Sets of Clothes by Residence (%)

Residence	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban		
Rural	86.1	85.3
Urban	97.1	94.7
Region		
Kampala	99.8	98.5
Central	95.7	94.2
Eastern	83.7	87.5
Northern	74.9	69.1
Western	91.3	90.2
Uganda	88.0	87.0

Appendix I shows that the proportion of households within which each member had at least two sets of clothes increased by quintile. The lowest quintile registered 73 percent of households whereas the highest quintile had 97 percent.

8.2 Household Members Aged Less than 18 having own Blanket

Having a blanket is a basic necessity of life. The survey sought to know whether each member of a household under the age of 18 years had a separate blanket.

Results in Table 8.2 show that, overall 35 percent of households had children having a separate blanket. The proportions were higher for urban households (55%) compared to 32 percent for rural households. Regional variations show that one half of the households in the Central region had all their children sleeping under a separate blanket while the Northern region had the least proportion (18%).

35% of the households had children with a separate blanket

Table 8.2: Possession of Blanket by Household Member(s) Aged Under 18 (%)

Residence	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban		
Rural	34.5	31.6
Urban	67.7	54.5
Region		
Kampala	80.9	58.8
Central	52.5	49.6
Eastern	23.7	30.5
Northern	17.1	18.2
Western	50.8	34.8
Uganda	39.6	35.3

The proportions of households by quintiles show that within the lowest quintile 20 percent had all children under 18 years with a blanket, whereas the highest quintile had 60 percent (See Appendix I).

8.3 Every Household Member possessing at least a Pair of Shoes

Possession of a pair of shoes in good condition was considered. This excluded slippers, tyre shoes (*lugabire*) and gumboots. One half of the households had all members possessing at least one pair of shoes as indicated in Table 8.3. The proportion of urban households (81%) was almost twice that of the rural households (43%). There was a 5 percentage point increase in the proportion of households with all members having at least one pair of shoes when compared with UNHS 2002/03. The variation across regions was wide, with only 21 percent of households in Northern region having all members having at least one pair of shoes, while the corresponding figure for the Central region (excluding Kampala district) was 70 percent.

Table 8.3: Possession of at least a Pair of Shoes by Household Member(s) (%)

Residence	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban		
Rural	37.0	43.1
Urban	82.2	81.0
Region		
Kampala	94.3	92.5
Central	60.9	69.5
Eastern	25.2	34.1
Northern	22.3	21.4
Western	50.6	54.9
Uganda	44.7	49.7

Households in the highest quintile are more likely to have all members possessing a pair of shoes than those in the lowest quintile (See Appendix I). Only 27 percent of households in the lowest quintile had all members possessing at least a pair of shoes compared to 79 percent in the highest quintile.

8.4 Feeding Habits

Many people do not have enough to eat to meet their daily energy needs. More than one quarter of children under 5 years in developing countries are

malnourished. For young children, the lack of food retards their physical and mental development, and threatens their survival.

8.4.1 Proportion of Households that took One Meal a day

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the number of meals taken per day. The recommended number of meals per day is three i.e. breakfast, lunch and dinner. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that a one year old boy requires 1200 calories per day whereas a man engaged in subsistence farming requires 3000 calories a day. The calories differ by the type of food and frequency of consumption.

The results in Table 8.4 show that overall, 8 percent of households took one meal a day. This is consistent with the findings of UNHS 2002/03. More households in the rural areas (9%) took one meal a day compared to their urban counterparts (6%). Regional variations show that the Northern region registered the highest proportion of households (18%) that took only one meal a day compared to other regions. The increase in the proportion of households in rural areas that took one meal a day between the two survey periods could partly be explained by the findings in the qualitative module which revealed that about half of the sites visited reported drought as one of the major shocks suffered.

However, the Northern and Western regions registered a decline in the proportion of households taking one meal a day when compared to 2002/03 UNHS, but other regions registered an increase.

Table 8.4: Distribution of Households that took One Meal a day (%)

Residence	2002/03	2005/06
Rural/Urban		
Rural	6.0	9.0
Urban	8.1	6.3
Region		
Kampala	5.3	6.4
Central	3.7	9.6
Eastern	3.0	4.8
Northern	25.1	18.4
Western	4.5	3.8
Uganda	7.7	8.5

In the lowest quintile, 20 percent of households took one meal a day compared to only 3 percent of households in the highest quintile (*See Appendix I*).

About one in every ten rural households took one meal a day

One in every ten households gave nothing to children below 5 years for breakfast

8.4.2 Breakfast for Children Under 5 years by Residence

The survey investigated the content of breakfast given to children below 5 years. Table 8.5 shows that 27 percent of households provided tea with solid food as breakfast for their children whereas 13 percent provided milk tea with sugar. However, 10 percent of households provided nothing for breakfast to children below 5 years. Urban households were more likely to provide nutritious breakfast to children less than 5 years than their rural counterparts.

Table 8.5: Breakfast for Children Aged Below 5 years by Residence

Breakfast Content	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Tea/drink (with or without sugar) and solid food	25.8	34.9	27.0
Milk/Milk tea with sugar	11.5	18.8	12.9
Porridge (with or without sugar) and solid food	25.4	19.7	24.6
Porridge with milk	3.4	5.3	3.7
Solid food only	14.1	3.3	12.5
Nothing	11.2	5.2	10.3
Others	8.9	12.8	9.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

8.4.3 Breakfast for Children Under 5 years by Region

On a regional basis, 18 percent of households in the Central region provided milk tea with sugar to their children compared to only 3 percent in the Northern region as given in Table 8.6. Across all regions, tea/drink/porridge with solid food was the most common type of breakfast provided to children below 5 years, but it was more pronounced in the Western region. In addition, 16 percent of households in the Northern region gave nothing for breakfast to children, compared to the Central region whose corresponding figure is only 3 percent.

16% of households in the north gave nothing to children below 5 years for breakfast

Table 8.6: Breakfast for Children Aged Below 5 years by Regions (%)

Breakfast Content	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western
Tea/drink (with or without sugar) and solid food	38.8	36.6	28.1	25.8	15.6
Milk/Milk tea with sugar	20.0	18.3	15.3	2.7	11.8
Porridge (with or without sugar) and solid food	16.7	15.8	25.0	24.9	33.5
Porridge with milk	4.6	5.9	2.7	0.3	5.4
Solid food only	1.8	6.9	13.3	19.8	12.6
Nothing	2.0	2.8	10.2	15.9	14.0
Others	16.3	13.7	5.2	10.7	7.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

19% of households in the lowest quintile gave nothing for breakfast to children below 5 years

As displayed in Appendix I, households in the higher quintiles were more likely to provide milk tea with sugar for breakfast to children less than 5 years than those in lower quintiles. Within the highest quintile, 27 percent provided their children below 5 years milk tea with sugar for breakfast compared to two percent in the lowest quintile.

8.4.4 Action Taken when Salt last run out

The UNHS 2005/06 also sought to know what action households took when they last ran out of salt. This is a welfare indicator as salt is an essential commodity to the household, but also cheap to acquire. The question was only applicable to households that cooked at home and the findings revealed that 97 percent of all households cooked at home.

More than two in every three households bought salt when it last run out.

The results in Table 8.7 indicate that more than two thirds of households bought salt and about one third borrowed from their neighbors when salt last run out. The Table further shows that overall, about two percent of households took food without salt when it last ran out. In rural areas, three percent of households took food without salt when it last run out compared to one percent in urban areas.

Table 8.7: Distribution of Households by Action Taken when Salt Last run Out

Residence	2005/06		
	Borrowed from neighbor	Bought	Did without
Rural/Urban			
Rural	31.5	65.8	2.7
Urban	18.8	80.3	1.0
Region			
Kampala	14.3	85.0	0.7
Central	20.3	76.6	3.1
Eastern	43.2	54.4	2.4
Northern	29.4	67.8	2.9
Western	29.3	68.8	1.9
Uganda	29.4	68.2	2.4

Households in the lowest quintile were more likely to borrow salt

The proportion of households that borrowed salt decreases as you move from the lowest to highest quintile and the reverse is true for households which bought salt when it last run out (See Appendix I).

8.5 Ownership of Selected Household Assets

Asset ownership is one of the proxy indicators for welfare measurement. The Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Programme studies have shown that a radio and a bicycle are regarded as one of the most important assets for welfare ranking. In this study, the ownership referred to is by any usual member of the household and is presumed to mean that all members can access the asset. A bicycle is an asset to the household as well as a means of transport.

8.5.1 Means of Transport

The results in Table 8.8 show that 39 percent of households owned a bicycle, compared to 33 percent reported in the 2002 census. The Eastern region had the highest proportion of households that owned a bicycle (50%), followed by the Northern region (45%).

8.5.2 Households' Access to Information

The results further show that 64 percent of the households owned electronic equipment. The Central region had the highest proportion of households with electronic equipment whereas the Northern region had the lowest. Overall, 17 percent of households possessed at least one mobile phone.

Four in every ten households owned a bicycle

17% of households owned at least one mobile phone.

15% of households had member(s) that possessed a savings account

8.5.3 Savings Account

Information on whether any member(s) of the household possessed a savings account with a formal institution was also collected. This is an indicator of the households' saving ability. The results show that overall, 15 percent of households had at least a member possessing a savings account with a formal institution. A higher proportion of households in the Central region possessed a savings account while the Eastern and Northern region had slightly similar proportions. In addition, the proportion of households with member(s) in possession of a savings account was highest in the highest quintile and the reverse is true for the lowest quintile (See Appendix I).

Table 8.8: Distribution of Households by Possession of Selected Household Assets and Region (%)

Household assets	2005/06					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
House	33.9	73.3	88.7	87.4	87.2	80.4
Furniture	94.7	91.3	94.1	78.0	94.6	90.4
Furnishings*	99.1	98.4	97.9	96.7	96.6	97.5
Household appliances*	66.1	59.5	35.7	33.4	16.1	38.4
Electronic equipment*	80.0	76.3	58.3	40.8	69.1	63.6
Bicycle	9.2	39.6	49.7	44.5	33.4	39.2
Motor cycle	1.8	5.0	1.3	0.9	2.9	2.6
Other transport equipment*	5.5	2.1	1.0	0.4	0.9	1.4
Jewellery and watches	61.2	36.8	26.7	21.2	36.8	33.1
Mobile phone	57.6	23.4	11.4	5.4	12.4	16.7
Financial assets						
Savings account*	39.5	15.8	10.4	9.3	14.6	14.7

*Furnishings includes carpets, mats, mattresses etc

*Household appliances includes kettle, flat iron etc

*Electronic equipment includes television sets, radios, radio cassettes, etc

*Other transport equipment includes motor vehicles, boats, donkeys, etc.

*Savings account refer to formal institution

8.6 Median Value of Household Assets

The most valuable non-financial asset for most households was houses, with a reported median value of shs. 280,000 as shown in Table 8.9. The median value of the house owned by households varied from shs. 70,000 in the Northern region to shs. 500,000 in the Central region. Overall, the median value of furniture owned by households was shs. 39,000. The value for household furniture was highest in the Central region (shs. 70,000) and lowest in Northern region (shs. 10,000).

Table 8.9: Median Value of the Selected Household Assets by Region ('000)

Household Assets	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
House	5,000	500	200	70	400	280
Furniture	150	70	30	10	35	39
Furnishings	95	60	40	15	50	45
Household appliances	20	12	10	10	10	12
Electronic equipment	90	20	15	15	15	15
Bicycle	60	40	50	60	50	50
Motor cycle	1,500	1,000	800	1,300	1,400	1,000
Other transport equipment	5,000	7,000	5,000	4,000	6,500	6,000
Jewellery and watches	10	10	6	4	5	6
Mobile phone	150	120	100	120	100	120

8.7 Participation in Local Governance

Household participation on LC I, LCII and LCIII committees exposes these households to more information. Given that service delivery agents always target these structures, it is most likely that households which participate on these committees may have increased access to social services. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on whether a household had any member on the LC1, LC2 or LC3 committee.

Rural households were more likely to participate in local governance compared to the urban households

The results in Table 8.10 show that 15 percent of the households in Uganda had a member who was on LC1, LC2 or LC3 committee. The proportion of households in rural areas was almost double that in urban areas. The proportion of households participating in local governance was highest in Western region (20%) and close to 13 percent in both the Central and Eastern region. This is because the Western region was more fragmented into smaller LCIs than other regions.

Table 8.10: Distribution of Households with a member(s) that Participated in Local Governance (%)

Residence	Households with at least a member(s) that participated in Local Governance
Rural/Urban	
Rural	16.2
Urban	7.9
Region	
Kampala	4.0
Central	13.1
Eastern	13.6
Northern	14.9
Western	20.0
Uganda	14.9

Worth noting also is that households within the highest quintile (21%) were more likely to have a member(s) on the LCI, LCII or LCIII committee compared to those in the lowest quintile (8%). This may be having something to do with education and wealth of the households' members in the quintiles and therefore their perceived social status.


8.8 Households' Economic Activities Affected by Theft or Violence

According to the PEAP, Uganda continues to be severely affected by natural and man-made disasters and conflicts. The prevalence of security in the country has long been recognized as a precondition for improved human welfare and one of the key factors necessary for achieving all the other goals of the PEAP. Crime prevention enhances poverty reduction, not only because people are directly hurt by its prevalence, but also because it reduces their willingness to invest. Being safe from crime and violence restores people's confidence and concentration, and thus increases output. Economic crime among young people is often a reflection of poverty and domestic problems according to some studies.

Nine percent of the households' economic activity was affected by theft or violence.

Results show that overall, 10 percent of the households had their economic activity affected by theft or violence (See Figure 8.1). On the extreme, economic activities in about one-quarter of the households in the Northern region were affected by theft or violence. This is partly attributed to people being congested in IDP camps where several of them do not have a reliable source of income. The Northern region (23%) dominated, followed by Central region with 10 percent, while the least proportion of households whose economic activity was affected by theft or violence was reported in the Eastern region (5%).

Figure 8.1: Distribution of Households Affected by Theft or Violence (%)



8.9 Summary of Findings

The ownership of clothes by household members was almost the same between 2002/03 and 2005/06, that of blankets declined by 4 percentage points while that of possession of a pair of shoes increased by 6 percentage points. Overall, 8 percent of the households took one meal a day. The recommended number of meals per day by World Health Organization is three i.e. breakfast, lunch and dinner. Ten percent of the households had their children aged less than 5 years take nothing for breakfast and yet one of the objectives of the MDGs is to eradicate poverty and hunger.

Thirty nine percent of the households owned a bicycle, which serves as a means of transport as well as a household enterprise asset. Only three percent of the households owned a motor cycle two percent owned a motor vehicle. Radios were the main means of communication for the household. Sixty four percent of the households owned electronic equipment. A savings account is an indicator of the households' saving ability. Only 15 percent of the households in Uganda had at least one of its member(s) operating a savings account with a formal institution.

CHAPTER NINE

HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS

9.0 Introduction

One of the targets of Millennium Development Goal 1 is improvement of lives of slum dwellers. This is in line with the PEAP priority actions for housing where the Government is required to establish the need for local public infrastructure in low-income urban areas in order to improve the lives of slum dwellers. The overwhelming majority of housing in Uganda is provided by the private sector (including individual households) and therefore the main task of public policy is to make the housing market work better³⁹. The Government is charged with a role of putting in place regulations to ensure minimum standards and prevent the negative externalities that are associated with extreme overcrowding and lack of proper sanitation.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information relating to the characteristics of dwellings such as dwelling type, rooms occupied, occupancy tenure and main construction materials used for the floor, roof and walls. Household conditions such as type of power/fuel used for lighting and cooking; cooking technology, type of toilet facility (if any), access to safe water, average distance and waiting time at the sources of water were also covered.

9.1 Type of Dwelling Unit

The Survey defined a dwelling as a building or a group of buildings in which the household lives. It can be a hut, a group of huts, a single house, a group of houses, an apartment and several one-room apartments among others. Figure 9.1 shows that households residing in detached dwelling units comprised 61 percent of the entire households which was an increase from 56 percent recorded in 2002/03 survey. Households residing in huts reduced from 26 percent to 22 percent over the two survey periods and those residing in tenement dwellings also reduced by two percentage points from 17 percent to 15 percent.

The Western region had the highest proportion of households residing in detached dwellings (84%) while the Northern region had the least (28%). Most households in Kampala were residing in tenements (64%). Huts were dominant in the Northern region constituting about two thirds of the dwelling units.

About 2/3 of Households in Kampala were resident in Tenements

³⁹ MoFPED 2004, Poverty eradication Action Plan 2004/5-2007/8

Figure 9.1: Distribution of Dwelling Types (%)




Table 9.1: Distribution of Dwelling Types by Region (%)

Type	2005/06					
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Detached	31.2	73.8	57.4	27.8	84.2	60.5
Huts	0.0	2.7	30.7	67.7	3.4	22.0
Tenement	64.3	22.2	10.0	2.7	9.2	15.2
Others*	4.5	1.3	1.9	1.7	3.2	2.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0


*includes flats, uniports, garages and boys quarters

9.2 Occupancy Tenure of Dwelling Unit

Occupancy tenure refers to the arrangements under which the household resides in a dwelling. The arrangements include renting, owner occupancy and dwelling supplied free. Ownership of a dwelling unit represents security of tenure of a household.

Figure 9.2 shows that a large percentage of households (78%) lived in their owner-occupied dwellings while 16 percent rented. This was not so different from what was reported in the 2002/03 survey. However, Table 9.2 shows that the conditions were different in Kampala where a large number of households (64%) occupied rented structures whereas only 28 percent lived in owner-occupied dwellings.

About three quarters of households owned the dwelling units they occupied

Figure 9.2: Distribution of Tenure Status (%)**Table 9.2: Tenure Status of Dwelling Units by Region (%)**

Type of Tenure	2005/06					
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Owner occupied	27.8	69.4	86.5	89.3	85.1	78.3
Rented	64.3	20.8	9.2	4.8	10.0	15.3
Free	7.9	9.7	4.2	5.7	5.0	6.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

9.3 Rooms used for Sleeping

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the number of rooms that households used for sleeping. The results in Table 9.3 show that more than one half of all households had only one room used for sleeping. Regional variations show that about 8 out of every 10 households in the Northern region and close to three quarters of households in Kampala had one room used for sleeping purposes. The Northern and Eastern regions had the highest average number of people (4 people) per sleeping room while other regions had about 3 people.

Almost three quarters of households in Kampala had one room for sleeping

Table 9.3: Distribution of Households by Number of rooms used for Sleeping and Average Number of People per room by Region (%)

Number of Rooms	2005/06					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
One	73.6	50.9	58.1	80.1	36.5	56.3
Two	13.0	24.4	20.7	13.2	30.1	22.0
More than two	13.5	24.7	21.2	6.8	33.4	21.8
Total	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average number of people per room	3.1	3.1	3.7	4.0	2.9	3.4

9.4 Construction Materials for Dwelling Units

Construction materials not only indicate the durability and permanency of a dwelling unit but also denote the economic status of the household. The results show a slight decrease in the proportion of households that resided in dwellings roofed with iron sheets from 63 percent to 61 percent between the two survey periods. The percentage of households residing in grass thatched structures increased from 35 percent to 38 percent. Other roofing materials combined comprised a paltry one percent of all dwellings. The Qualitative Module reports that the bi-functional use of iron sheets (harvesting rain water and shelter) was one of the major reasons given by the Communities for preferring them to other roofing materials.

61% of all dwellings were roofed with iron sheets

Dwellings with brick walls were slightly more than one half of all structures in the country. Those with mud and pole walls also comprised a relatively large proportion (42%). Variations in residence show that more than three quarters of all dwellings in urban areas had brick walls whereas in rural areas, they were less than half. In addition, most dwellings in the rural areas (47%) had mud and pole walls.

One in every two dwellings had a brick wall

Seventy four percent of all households used earth for floor construction. Cement use increased from 24 percent to 26 percent over the two survey periods. Variations in residence show that earth floors were still dominant in the rural areas (83%) while in the urban areas, cement (69%) was the most commonly used material.

74% of all dwellings had earth floors

Table 9.4: Distribution of Households by Type of Construction Materials and Residence (%)

Material Used	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Roof						
Iron sheets	58.6	86.4	63.3	55.9	82.7	60.6
Thatched	40.9	8.2	35.4	43.2	14.2	38.2
Other roof*	0.5	5.5	1.3	0.9	3.1	1.3
Wall						
Bricks	45.3	77.4	50.7	48.0	79.2	53.4
Mud and Poles	51.7	17.3	45.8	47.2	17.2	42.0
Other wall**	3.1	5.3	3.5	4.8	3.6	4.6
Floor						
Earth	83.1	27.2	73.5	82.8	29.6	73.5
Cement	15.2	66.9	24.0	16.5	68.6	25.6
Other floor***	1.7	5.9	2.5	0.8	1.8	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*includes tiles, tin, cement, asbestos and wood planks

**includes timber. Stone, thatch and straw and cement blocks

***includes mosaic or tiles, bricks, wood, and others not described

9.5 Domestic Energy Resources

The types of energy and technology used for domestic cooking and lighting purposes have an impact on the health of household members and the environment around them. 'The lack of clean fuels has a direct impact on rural households which depend on wood... and charcoal for cooking.'⁴⁰ The technology that is used in cooking impacts on both indoor and environmental pollution. One of the targets of Millennium Development Goal 7 is to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources such as forests and trees.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Uganda's forests are being seriously degraded, and encroachment is to blame for this (PEAP). The Government through the Ministry of Energy is promoting the use of efficient cooking technologies so as to reduce the pressure on the trees and forest resources, reduce pollution and save financial resources of households.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on sources of energy that households used both for lighting and cooking purposes as well as the kind of technology used in cooking. The findings are as below.

Use of wood Fuel
for cooking is
almost universal

9.5.1 Main Source of Cooking and Lighting Fuel

Table 9.5 reveals that 78 percent of the households depended on firewood for cooking and 18 percent on charcoal. Overall, 96 percent of the households depended on wood fuel for cooking purposes which is a challenge to achieving the MDG targets and promotion of environmental sustainability. A very small proportion of households (less than 1%) used electricity as the main source of energy for cooking. Variations in residence show that charcoal was mainly used in urban areas (66%) while firewood was more prominent in rural areas (89%).

Table 9.5: Distribution of Households by Cooking Fuel and Residence (%)

2005/06						
Residence	Cooking Fuel					Total
	Firewood	Charcoal	Kerosene	Electricity	Other*	
Rural/Urban						
Rural	89.4	8.2	0.8	0.1	1.6	100.0
Urban	22.9	66.1	3.5	0.8	6.8	100.0
Region						
Kampala	5.8	77.7	5.2	1.4	9.9	100.0
Central	70.2	24.5	2.0	0.2	3.2	100.0
Eastern	86.1	11.4	0.7	0.1	1.7	100.0
Northern	88.3	10.7	0.4	0.0**	0.7	100.0
Western	89.5	7.8	0.5	0.1	2.1	100.0
Uganda	77.8	18.2	1.2	0.2	2.5	100.0

*includes LP gas, saw dust, biogas

** Its not zero, but the percentage is less than 0.1%

The Tadooba is still
the major source of
lighting across
regions

Table 9.6 indicates that majority of the households (71%) used Tadooba⁴¹ for lighting purposes contributing to indoor pollution through smoke and soot it emits, while 14 percent used kerosene lanterns. Only 11 percent of households used electricity as the main source of lighting. Variations by residence show that the proportion of households using electricity in rural areas was very small (4%). Even in urban areas, less than half of households used electricity as the main source of lighting. Electricity for lighting was least used in the Northern region (1%) and used most in the Central region (15%).

⁴⁰ United Nations 2005, The Millennium Development Goals Report

⁴¹ A locally made simple paraffin candle

Table 9.6: Distribution of Lighting Fuel by Residence and Region (%)

Residence	2005/06				Total
	Tadooba	Lantern	Electricity	Other*	
Rural/Urban					
Rural	79.1	12.3	4.0	4.7	100.0
Urban	31.2	23.4	41.2	4.2	100.0
Region					
Kampala	13.1	20.5	60.6	5.7	100.0
Central	64.6	17.6	15.1	2.8	100.0
Eastern	81.2	12.3	5.0	1.6	100.0
Northern	79.9	7.6	1.4	11.1	100.0
Western	76.0	16.1	4.2	3.7	100.0
Uganda	70.7	14.2	10.5	4.6	100.0

*Includes firewood, biogas

9.5.2 Technology used in cooking

The survey results reveal that the most widely used cooking technology were the traditional three stones that accounted for 73 percent and the Sigiri (traditional metal charcoal stove) followed with 15 percent. Only 9 percent of all households used Improved Charcoal and Firewood stoves.

Less than 10 percent of all households used Improved charcoal and firewood stoves

Table 9.7: Distribution of Type of Cooking Technology by Region (%)

	2005/06					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Three stones	6.1	68.1	84.2	72.1	85.8	72.7
Open charcoal stove	72.6	20.3	10.8	2.8	6.6	14.8
Improved stoves	4.8	6.6	3.1	23.2	5.6	8.7
Paraffin stove	5.0	1.8	0.5	0.1	0.3	1.0
Other*	11.6	3.3	1.5	1.7	1.8	2.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*includes electric plate, gas stove and saw dust stove

9.6 Type of Toilet Facility

Use of appropriate toilet facilities is important in hygiene related illnesses like diarrhoea, intestinal infections and cholera among others. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information about the use of toilet facilities and the actual type that the household used. Table 9.8 shows that about one in ten of households did not use any toilet facility. About 86 percent of households used a pit latrine while only three percent used a Ventilated Improved Pit-latraine (V.I.P).

11 percent of households did not use any toilet facility

Variations in regions indicate that the Northern and Eastern regions (21% and 16% respectively) had the largest proportion of households not using any toilet facility. Between residences, the rural areas had a higher proportion without access to any toilet facility than that in urban.

The Qualitative Module reveals that although 86 percent of households used pit latrines, the type and quality varied. The module identified different types including, latrines covered with logs, those without walls and some with no roof. The module further reports that the major reasons why some households still had unhygienic toilet facilities (and not owning any) in some areas were; lack of resources like money and land, unfavourable terrain, poor soil type and high water tables among others.

Table 9.8: Distribution of Households by Type of Toilet Facilities, Residence and Region (%)

Residence	2005/06				Total
	Pit Latrine	V.I.P	Flush	Bush/no toilet	
Rural/Urban					
Rural	85.7	1.9	0.2	12.2	100.0
Urban	86.1	5.4	5.8	2.7	100.0
Region					
Kampala	85.2	4.6	9.1	1.1	100.0
Central	90.4	4.0	0.6	5.0	100.0
Eastern	81.6	1.2	1.0	16.2	100.0
Northern	75.4	3.2	0.1	21.2	100.0
Western	93.5	0.9	0.4	5.2	100.0
Uganda	85.8	2.5	1.1	10.6	100.0

9.7 Source of Water for Drinking

Goal 7 of the MDGs aims among others at halving the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water. In line with the PEAP, the targets of the water sector include; sustainable safe water supply and sanitation facilities within easy reach for 77 percent of the rural population and 100 percent of the urban population by the year 2015.⁴²

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the main sources of water that household members drink. Safe water sources were regarded as taps, boreholes,

⁴² Uganda Poverty Status Report 2005. Progress in implementing the PEAP. MoFPED, Kampala

protected springs and gravity flow schemes. The rest of the sources were considered to be unsafe.

Two thirds of all households had access to safe water sources

The results show that 68 percent of all households had access to safe water sources. In the urban areas 87 percent had access to safe water while in rural areas, the proportion was 64 percent. However, there is increasing concern that despite improving access to safe water supplies, the quality of water when it is finally consumed is frequently diminished as a result of poor hygiene practices in maintaining a safe water chain.⁴³

Table 9.9: Distribution of Households Accessing Safe Water by Residence (%)

	2002/03			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Safe Water	57.6	86.9	62.6	63.6	86.8	67.6
Unsafe Water	42.4	13.0	37.4	36.4	13.2	32.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

9.8 Distance to Source of Drinking Water

Bringing water closer to the households to reduce on the time taken to walk to safe water points is the ideal situation for the key players and stakeholders in the water sector. Long distances to water sources and long queues at even nearby water points mean that a lot of valuable time that would be spent on other activities is wasted in collecting water.

Table 9.10 shows that 72 percent of households had the main sources of drinking water within a kilometre from the dwelling and 28 percent had it between 1 to 5 kilometres. The average distance to the main source of drinking water was about a kilometre for Uganda while the waiting time for water was almost half an hour. In the Northern region, although the average distance was about a kilometre, the average time taken in queues for water (54 minutes) almost doubled the national average and that of other regions.

Mean waiting time for water in the Northern region, is almost an hour

⁴³ MoFPED 2004, Poverty eradication Action Plan 2004/05-2007/08

Table 9.10: Distance to Main Water Source by Region (%)

Distance	2005/06					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Less than 1km	95.9	72.3	67.9	72.7	67.5	71.6
1-5km	4.1	26.8	31.1	26.6	31.7	27.6
More than 5km	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average distance	0.2	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Average waiting time (Minutes)	10.0	16.0	32.6	53.8	18.1	28.0

9.9 Summary of Findings

More than one half of dwellings were detached while one fifth of households lived in huts. More than three quarters of households owned dwelling units, a proportion similar to that of the previous survey. One quarter of households still rented their dwelling units. Almost two thirds of dwellings had iron sheets as roofing material, one half were constructed with brick walls and over three quarters had earth floors.

One in every ten households had no toilet facility. Almost all households depended on firewood and charcoal for cooking and the biggest proportion depended on traditional inefficient and 'wasteful' technologies that put the environment at risk. The average distance to main sources of drinking water was about a kilometre and the average waiting time at these water points was about half an hour.

Attention should be put to the plight of the poor households whose day-to-day subsistence is often directly linked to the natural resources around them. Provision and promotion of alternative and relatively cheap but clean energy resources is the ideal way to reverse the loss of environmental resources, protect the remaining natural resources and promote a healthy lifestyle among households.

CHAPTER TEN

GENDER AND SELECTED HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

10.0 Introduction

Gender⁴⁴ concerns have increasingly gained prominence at both the local and international scenes. Gender is widely used to refer to the socially constructed differences and distinctions between men and women. It is a culturally specific set of characteristics that identifies the social position of women and men and the relationship between them. The different roles played by women and men and the imbalances in access to resources, power, economic opportunities due to low bargaining power, among other reasons simply on account of one's gender are in existence at varying degrees. Because women are central to the growth process, their contribution should not be constrained by socially constructed barriers. The World Bank report on Engendering Development suggests that gender like ethnicity is a social category that largely establishes one's life chances and shapes one's participation in society and economy (World Bank 2001). Yet equal rights and opportunities are core to the development process of any country which are well recognised in both the PEAP and MDGs.

Within the PEAP, gender has been identified as a cross cutting issue and this chapter highlights some of the gender differences emerging from the survey. The analysis is by sex because the way gender is operationalised in a given context is through the respondents' sex. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on different aspects of the households and the roles of some of the individual members of households. Information was collected on time spent on both economic and Care Labour activities. These included time spent fetching water, collecting firewood, cooking, earnings of household members, main occupation and industry, care for orphans and health seeking behaviour. In addition, time spent on the different economic activities either as employees or in self employment was also collected. This is in addition to other gender issues that have been reported elsewhere in the report.

⁴⁴ Gender refers to culturally defined aspects of being male or female (Resources for Population, Nutrition and Health 1997)

One in every four households is headed by a female

10.1 Household Headship

Women contribute a lot to household production. However, decision making at household level is in many cases a man's preserve particularly in the male dominated society. Findings in Table 10.1 show that about one in every four households was headed by a female. This is consistent with the UNHS 2002/03 figure of 28 percent female headed households. There were more female headed households in urban than in rural areas. The Northern region had slightly more female heads of households than any other region and this may be partly due to the effects of the long period of insecurity in the region.

Table 10.1: Distribution of Household Heads by Sex and Residence (%)

Residence	Male Head	Female Head	Total
Rural/Urban			
Urban	70.7	29.3	100.0
Rural	73.6	26.4	100.0
Region			
Kampala	71.0	29.0	100.0
Central	70.6	29.4	100.0
Eastern	75.9	24.1	100.0
Northern	69.2	30.8	100.0
Western	76.5	23.5	100.0
Uganda	73.1	26.9	100.0

10.2 Education Level of Household Head

Education plays a significant role in improving overall human development. As shown in the UDHS 2000, the lower the education level of women, the higher the Total Fertility Rate (TFR). Those with no education reported a TFR of 7.8 compared to a TFR of 3.9 among women with the level of education exceeding primary. Clearly, chances of both women and men competing in employment and earnings are influenced by the level of education attained.

39% of the female headed households lacked any formal education

Survey findings in Table 10.2 show that, 39 percent of women headed households had no formal education while 44 percent had only primary level education. The proportion of female household heads that had attained secondary education was 10 percent which constitutes about half of the percentage of male heads of households with the same level of education. The lack of and low level of education makes women less competitive on the job market and more likely to only get low paying jobs.

Table 10.2: Distribution of Household Heads by Educational Level (%)

Highest Education Level Attained	Male Headed	Female Headed	Uganda
No formal schooling	10.2	38.7	17.9
Primary	60.0	43.7	55.6
Secondary	20.8	10.3	17.9
Post secondary	8.9	7.2	8.5
Do not know	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

10.3 Household Headship by Marital Status

The demographic characteristics of household heads give an indication of the extent of the burden households are likely to experience. Such factors are likely to lead to high social and economic demands on the household head, and an increased likelihood of being poor. Women household heads are more likely to be widowed or divorced (61%) than male household heads (6%) as shown in Table 10.3. This may be attributed to the fact that men tend to remarry faster than women in the event of divorce or death of a partner hence the low percentage for widowers.

61% of women household heads are either widowed or divorced

Table 10.3: Distribution of Heads of Households by Sex and Marital Status

Marital Status	Male Headed	Female Headed	Uganda
Married- monogamous	69.9	14.9	55.1
Married -polygamous	18.5	17.1	18.1
Divorced/separated	4.1	19.3	8.2
Widow/widower	2.1	41.7	12.8
Never married	5.4	6.9	5.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

10.4 Care Giving Roles for Orphans

Orphans comprise one of the vulnerable groups in Uganda and are recognized in both the Policy on Orphans and other Vulnerable Children and the National Strategic Plan on OVC. Findings in Table 10.4 show that about 15 percent of all children in Uganda are orphaned.

Female heads are more likely to live with orphans than male heads of households

Table 10.4: Distribution of Orphans by Sex of Household Head (%)


Orphanhood	Male Headed	Female Headed	Uganda
Orphan	8.9	33.3	14.7
Non Orphan	91.1	66.7	85.3
Uganda	100.0	100.0	100.0

The severity of the symptoms of an illness is a determinant of source of care

10.5 Factors influencing Choice of Health Provider

The decision to seek health care is determined by several factors including level of income, residence, Socio-economic status, among others. Findings show that persons in households headed by males are more likely to visit private clinics than female heads of households irrespective of the type of illness. Although respondents reported using private clinics more than Government health facilities, there is some evidence to show that the type of illness and its symptoms are probably a major factor in determining the source of care. Persons residing in Female headed households for instance were more likely to visit a Government health facility when experiencing Diarrhoea than male heads of households.

Figure 10.1: Distribution of Treatment Source by Type of illness and Sex of Household Head (%)



Half of the female heads of households are unpaid family workers

10.6 Activity Status of Household Members

Differences in opportunities between men and women arise due to differences in education, work skills, ownership of assets, exposure, bargaining power and other characteristics. Women tend to be disadvantaged due to lack of the above mentioned qualities which sometimes are socially made. Results in Table 10.6

show that 40 percent of the females are engaged in self employment compared to 52 percent of the males. There are twice as many women who are unpaid family workers as there are men. The contribution women make is usually not recognized under the UN system of national accounts yet it accounts for most of the women's time and efforts. Although the proportion of people in paid employment is very low (both casual and permanent), women constitute only one third of all the employed persons.

Table 10.6: Distribution of Household members by Activity status (%)

Activity Status	Female	Male	Uganda
Self employed	40.0	52.0	45.8
Unpaid Family worker	50.1	23.6	37.2
Permanent employee	2.6	6.5	4.5
Temporary/Casual Employee	6.4	17.4	11.7
Not stated	0.9	0.5	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

10.7 Industry of Employment of Household Head

Women participation in economic activity was investigated and related to the industry and occupation. Table 10.7 shows that majority of the women and indeed female heads of households were engaged in the primary sector (agriculture and hunting), followed by sales, manufacturing and education. The agricultural sector is characterized by uncertainty and low returns to labour and the limited coping opportunities. This is because it is predominantly of a subsistence nature.

Table 10.7 Distribution of Heads of Household by Industry (%)

Industry	Male headed	Female Headed	Uganda
Agriculture, Hunting	59.3	68.5	61.6
Sales	11.7	12.0	11.8
Manufacturing	6.4	4.9	6.0
Education	4.5	4.2	4.4
Transport, Storage	4.6	0.1	3.5
Construction	3.3	0.1	2.6
Others	10.2	10.1	10.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Majority of female headed households are engaged in agriculture and services as their main occupations

10.8 Main Occupations of Household Members

Respondents were asked about their main occupation. Findings show that females (79%) reported agriculture and fisheries as their main occupation followed by service and sales. This may partly explain their inability to compete in other occupations because of the lack of or low levels of education. The findings further show that women were more likely to be engaged in sales and service sector as their main occupation than men.

Table 10.8: Distribution of Occupations by Sex of Household Head (%)

Occupation	Male	Female	Uganda
Legislators/ Professionals	1.4	0.5	0.9
Technicians and Associated workers	3.5	1.9	2.7
Clerks	1.1	0.9	1.0
Service and Sales Workers	8.9	9.9	9.4
Agriculture and Fisheries worker	61.6	79.1	70.6
Crafts and Related traders	5.9	1.3	3.6
Plant and Machine Operators	3.2	1.2	2.2
Elementary Occupation	14.4	5.2	9.7
Uganda	100.0	100.0	100.0

The occupation women engaged in most reported the least income earned in cash of Shs 18,000

10.9 Income Earned by Occupation

Higher household incomes are closely associated with higher levels of education, increased access to opportunities and better nutrition among others (World Bank 2001). Higher income means that people have fewer resource constraints and leads to more equal human development for example in education and health for both males and females. Children living in households with well remunerated women tend to enjoy better overall care than those living in households headed by men. Respondents were asked about the last cash payment they received and the time unit (hourly, daily, weekly, monthly or yearly) it represents. Only cash income was considered during analysis although information on payments in kind was also collected. Cash payments received were converted to monthly equivalents. Results show that women mostly engaged in agriculture as their main occupation but the returns from the sector are very low as Table 10.9 shows. The gap in incomes increases depending on the type of occupation one is involved in. Manual work, elementary occupations, crafts and related workers have high income differentials compared to other occupations. The variation in income among the professionals is mainly due to the sector of employment, experience and qualifications rather than one's sex. Construction on the other hand is predominantly a male domain.

Table 10.9 Median Income by Occupation and by Sex ('000)

Occupations	Male	Female	Uganda
Legislators, and Managers/Professionals	250.0	169.0	200.0
Technicians and Associate Professionals	150.0	140.0	148.0
Clerks	100.0	60.0	80.0
Service Workers and Shop and Market Sale	75.0	30.0	52.2
Agriculture and Fishery Workers	36.2	18.1	27.2
Crafts and Related trade workers	90.5	50.0	90.5
Plant and Machine Operators and Assemble	90.5	150.0	90.5
Elementary Occupation	30.0	18.1	23.5

10.10 Income by Industry Grouping

Analysis by industry group in Table 10.10 shows that those engaged in real estates, renting and businesses, and Health and Social work and Education are more likely to receive higher cash payments than those in other sectors. The differences in cash incomes received vary from industry to industry but are evident in all the sectors. Public administration and education have the lowest differentials.

Table 10.10 Median Income by Industry and Sex ('000)

Industry	Men	Female	Uganda
Agriculture, Hunting and Forestry	20.0	18.1	18.1
Manufacturing	60.0	36.2	60.0
Construction	72.4	18.1	72.4
Sales	63.4	30.0	54.3
Hotels and Restaurants	40.0	21.7	27.2
Transport, Storage and Communications	90.5	54.3	90.5
Real Estate, Renting and Business	250.0	55.0	230.0
Public Administration	120.0	120.0	120.0
Education	140.0	120.0	130.0
Health and Social Work	181.0	130.0	150.0
Private household with employed Persons	30.0	20.0	25.0

10.11 Time Use by Households

Table 10.11 shows that on average, men spent less time on Care Labour and more on productive work per week. The converse is particularly true for women who spent most of their time on Care Labour that are widely regarded as unproductive. Care Labour consumes much of the women's time and yet it is not valued. The burden created by combining productive and non productive work is rarely recognized yet it imparts severe labour burdens on women. Across all

The time spent on Care Labour by women is six times that of men

classification, women are overburdened by Care Labour compared to men. This is in addition to the reproductive roles that women perform. The burden is more pronounced in the Northern region where time spent by women on Care Labour is almost 10 times that of men.

Table 10.11: Average weekly Number of Hours Spent on Different Activities by Sex

Residence	Economic		Care Labour	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Rural/Urban				
Urban	31.9	21.4	5.1	33.1
Rural	23.0	18.2	6.7	39.7
Region				
Kampala	37.9	21.7	5.2	31.9
Central	28.2	20.0	7.5	42.6
Eastern	22.3	17.2	5.3	33.5
Northern	15.5	13.1	5.0	47.3
Western	25.5	21.9	7.5	35.6

Note: Care Labour activities include cooking, fetching water, fetching firewood and taking care of children

10.12.1 Time use by occupation of Household Head

Classification of men and women by occupation is aimed at understanding the nature of activities that tend to exert undue burden to workers irrespective of sex. Findings show that across economic activities, the variations between sexes is not as wide as is the case for Care Labour as shown in Table 10.12. This is especially true in those occupations where there is a significant majority of women (sales and service workers and clerks).

Table 10.12: Distribution of Household Heads by Occupation (%)

Occupation	Male	Female
Legislators, senior Officials and Managers	40.3	29.2
Professionals	36.2	37.9
Technicians and Associate Professionals	36.8	40.2
Clerks	41.2	35.1
Service Workers and Shop and Market Sale	54.6	49.7
Agriculture and Fishery Workers	21.2	19.5
Crafts and Related trade workers	44.4	25.2
Plant and Machine Operators and Assemble	47.7	25.7
Elementary Occupation	39.1	34.5

Male heads of households earned more than their female counterparts

10.13 Wages/Salaries

Wage/salary earners have been shown to be less poor than those in subsistence agriculture. It is a form of cushion against extreme poverty in some cases if it is stable over a period of time. Findings in Table 10.13 show that on the overall, male heads of households received more income (cash payments) than female heads of households in both rural and urban areas and this is true across all regions.

Table 10.13: Wages by Sex of Household Head and Residence ('000)

Residence	Male Head	Female Head	Uganda
Rural/Urban			
Urban	120.0	89.0	108.6
Rural	40.0	18.1	36.2
Region			
Kampala	150.0	80.0	135.0
Central	72.4	40.0	72.4
Eastern	54.3	30.0	54.3
Northern	36.2	18.1	27.2
Western	38.0	18.1	30.0

10.14 Summary of Findings

The above findings further confirm that there exists some gender imbalances be it in employment, work load or in the social sector. Affirmative actions need to be taken a step further during implementation to narrow the gender gap that currently exists.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CHARACTERISTICS OF VULNERABLE GROUPS

11.0 Introduction

According to the Social Development Sector Strategic Investment Plan for Development (SDIP)⁴⁵ vulnerability relates to lack of security, susceptibility to risk and/or exploitation. It is a measure of resilience of individuals, households and Communities to withstand any shock that might result in increased poverty. The SDIP further categorizes vulnerable groups among others to include, asset-less widows, female headed households, child headed households, older persons, child labourers, and persons with disabilities.

Poor households in developing countries often suffer a multitude of risks affecting their livelihood. For households with agriculture as their main source of income, risk is a pervasive factor, and ecological risks such as drought, crop pests, or livestock diseases can reduce income sharply. Similarly, price fluctuations in input and output markets affect households. Other household shocks include, sudden illness or death of household member or major household provider. The pervasiveness of such risks is often coupled with insufficient risk coping ability due to low asset base and missing insurance, capital and factor markets.

For purposes of this survey, vulnerability is defined as the risk or exposure of an individual or group of individuals to events that threaten or seriously damage one or more aspects of well being. Such issues may include, conflict, drought, and death of a major household provider. This chapter therefore provides information on vulnerability at household level through household shocks and at individual level by providing a profile of selected vulnerable groups of children, widows, older persons and Persons with Disabilities (PWDs).

11.1 Household Shocks

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on household shocks that occurred within 5 years prior to the survey. These included drought, pest attack, livestock epidemic, poor seed quality and death of a household member. Multiple responses were recoded for those households that had experienced shocks in the last 5 years.


⁴⁵ MGLSD, Social Development Sector Strategic Investment Plan for Development (SDIP), 2003-2008, pg6

11.1.1 Prevalence and Type of Shock

Nearly two thirds of all households experienced at least one type of shock

The results for the households that had experienced at least one shock are shown in Figure 11.1. Nearly two in every three households in the country had experienced at least one type of shock. The Northern region had the highest prevalence of shocks (89%) whereas the Central Region had the lowest (53%). The Eastern and Western Regions had almost similar proportions of households reporting shocks.

Figure 11.1: Households that experienced at least one Shock in the Last 5 Years (%)



Further sub-grouping of shocks by rural-urban residence in Table 11.1 shows that rural households were more likely to experience shocks (69%) compared to the urban households (46%).

Rural households suffered from shocks mostly related to agriculture

Households were more likely to suffer from shocks related to agriculture. As high as 42 percent of all households reported that they were affected by drought, while 15 percent experienced floods or hailstorms. Rural areas experienced a similar trend. The results are similar to the findings from the qualitative module where drought, heavy rains, crop diseases and livestock diseases were mentioned as the most common shocks.

Table 11.1: Distribution of Households that Experienced Shocks, in the last 5 Years, by Residence (%)

Type of Shock	Urban	Rural	Uganda
Drought	15.6	47.8	42.2
Floods/hailstorm	4.5	16.6	14.5
Death other family members	12.4	14.1	13.8
Pest attack	3.8	12.1	10.6
Robbery/theft	12.2	9.8	10.2
Civil strife	7.7	10.8	10.3
Livestock epidemic	1.9	6.3	5.6
Fire accident	2.2	4.6	4.2
Death of household head	2.5	3.5	3.3
Injury from accident	4.0	2.6	2.8
Bad seed quality	1.0	2.8	2.5
Others	4.0	3.5	3.6
Uganda (at least one shock)	46.0	69.2	65.1

Note that each shock in the table above is analyzed independently.

11.1.2 Duration of Shocks

The median duration of the most serious shock lasted 4 months

Households that reported that they experienced shocks in the last 5 years were required to provide the year when the most serious shock happened and its duration in months. This information excluded those who reported death of a household head or other family member. The results as displayed in Table 11.2 show the median duration by type of most serious shock. Overall, the median duration of shocks experienced was 4 months.

Variations by region show that the households in the Western region had the highest median duration (5 months) followed by Central and Northern regions with 4 months. The results further show that households in the Western region that declared civil strife as the most serious shock revealed the median duration as 12 months. The longer duration in the Western region is probably due to the insurgence especially in the districts of Bundibugyo and Kasese that occurred during the year 2000. The results further show that the highest median duration was recorded for those who experienced civil strife (9 months) followed by pest attack (5 months).

Table 11.2: Median Duration in Months of Most Serious Shock by Region (%)

Type of Shock	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Drought	5	4	4	5	4
Floods/hailstorm	2	2	0	4	2
Pest attack	7	4	3	6	5
Bad seed quality	3	3	3	6	3
Livestock epidemic	3	2	3	4	3
Fire accident	4	2	2	3	2
Civil strife	3	6	9	12	9
Robbery/theft	2	2	1	2	2
Injury from accident	1	1	2	3	2
Others	3	3	6	4	4
Uganda	4	3	4	5	4

11.1.3 Coping Mechanisms

Extending social protection to all poor and vulnerable groups in Uganda remains a challenge for Government. The SDIP acknowledges that the current public provision of social protection in the country is limited to a large extent. The overall capacity to target those in need of social protection and at risk is limited. Government on the other hand has established interventions for instance in Northern Uganda, a region that has suffered from the effects of insurgency, through the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) programme under the Prime Minister's office. The programme aims at empowering Communities in the Northern region to identify and prioritize their needs, for sustainable development.

The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the types of coping mechanisms for households that suffered shocks. The results are displayed in Table 11.3. Use of savings ranked highest (20%) as a mitigation measure for those households that suffered from shocks, followed by reduced consumption (18%). About 4 percent of the households reported that they sold their assets as a means to overcome the shocks. A similar pattern is observed for those households in the rural areas. Such results are characteristic of the unmet need for social protection in the country. The qualitative module revealed similar findings whereby individual and household level initiatives such as use of domestic savings, sale of assets, reduction in the number of meals eaten per day and informal borrowing were reported as some of the coping strategies.

Use of savings
ranked highest as
a mitigation
measure

Table 11.3: Type of Mitigation Measures for Major Households Shocks by Residence (%)

Type of Shock	Urban	Rural	Uganda
Used savings	24.5	19.5	20.3
Reduced consumption	12.7	18.4	17.5
Help was provided by relatives and friends	21.0	15.7	16.5
Worked as self employed	8.9	8.5	8.5
More wage employment	5.0	6.0	5.8
Changed crop choices to avoid bad weather or pest attack	3.2	5.5	5.2
Sold assets	3.3	4.5	4.3
Help was provided from local Govt	3.8	3.9	3.9
Informal borrowing	4.4	3.4	3.5
Migration	13.3	14.6	14.4
Other	24.5	19.5	20.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Reducing consumption was the main coping mechanism for households that experienced agricultural shocks

It was shown in chapter four of this report that over 70 percent of the working age population was engaged in agriculture. Coping mechanisms for those households that experienced agricultural shocks is displayed in Table 11.4. Reducing consumption emerged as the highest mitigation measure (24%) followed by use of savings. Changing crop choices to avoid bad weather or pest attack accounted for 8 percent of the responses provided. The results further show that agricultural farmers are not accessing the existing services in the country.

Table 11.4: Distribution of Major Households Shocks related to Agriculture by**Type of Mitigation Measures (%)**

Type of Shock	Urban	Rural	Uganda
Reduced consumption	20.4	24.3	23.9
Used savings	25.1	20.5	20.9
Worked as self employed	12.9	9.7	10.0
Help was provided by relatives and friends	9.1	8.3	8.4
Changed crop choices to avoid bad weather or pest attack	6.9	8.2	8.1
More wage employment	6.1	7.5	7.4
Sold assets	3.2	4.5	4.4
Informal borrowing	4.5	4.3	4.3
Other	3.3	3.7	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

11.2 Characteristics of Selected Vulnerable Groups


11.2.1 Orphans

Tracking the progress and effectiveness of efforts to support orphans and other vulnerable children, helps in planning better programmes and raises awareness of the gravity of the problem at both national and international levels. In a bid to implement such processes, Government in 2004 developed a National Strategic Plan of Interventions for Orphans and other vulnerable Children (NSPI). The overall goal of this strategy is to increase the scale of effective programme interventions that reach orphans and other vulnerable children, either directly to the child or through the household.

15 percent of the children in 2005/06 were orphans

An orphan is a child aged below 18 years who has lost one or both parents. Figure 11.2 shows the proportion of children who were orphans. The results show that the proportion of children who were orphans has slightly increased overtime. In 2005/06, 15 percent of Uganda's children were orphans. This proportion increased from 12 percent in 1999/00 to 13 percent in 2002/03.

Figure 11.2: Orphanhood Rates in Uganda (%)



11.2.2 Parental Survival and Orphanhood

Table 11.5 shows the distribution of children by parental survival status. The findings reveal that paternal orphanhood (8%) was greater than maternal orphanhood (3%). More than three percent of the children had lost both parents. Regional variations show that the Central region had the highest percentage of orphans (18%) followed by the Northern region (16%). Children in urban areas are

18 % of the children in the Central region were orphans

more likely to be orphans than those in rural areas. It should be noted that the orphans were enumerated from their usual place of residence and not necessarily where the death of their parents occurred.

The results further show that as children tend to 17 years, they are more likely to be orphaned because the risk of a parent dying increases overtime. Three in every ten of the children aged 15 to 17 years was an orphan compared to 4 percent of the children aged less than 5 years. This is expected with the low life expectancy of 50 years.

Among children living in female headed households, more than 30 percent of them were orphans compared to 9 percent of those living in male headed households. This is characteristic of the fact that women are more likely to take on the role as caregivers than men.

Table 11.5: Distribution of Children (0-17), by Parental Survival and Selected Background Characteristics (%)

Background characteristic	Orphans			Other Children		All Categories	Percent Orphans
	Both Dead	Only Mother Dead	Only Father Dead	Both Alive	Don't Know		
Sex of Child							
Male	3.5	2.9	8.4	84.7	0.6	100.0	14.7
Female	3.6	2.9	8.1	84.8	0.6	100.0	14.6
Rural/Urban							
Urban	4.8	3.1	9.4	82.0	0.6	100.0	17.4
Rural	3.3	2.9	8.1	85.2	0.6	100.0	14.3
Region							
Kampala	5.5	2.6	7.3	84.2	0.4	100.0	15.4
Central	4.1	4.2	9.7	81.2	1.0	100.0	17.9
Eastern	1.9	2.4	7.5	87.6	0.6	100.0	11.8
Northern	4.9	2.7	8.2	83.8	0.3	100.0	15.9
Western	3.2	2.4	7.9	86.0	0.5	100.0	13.5
Age							
0-4	0.6	0.7	3.1	95.2	0.4	100.0	4.4
5-9	2.4	2.5	7.6	87.0	0.5	100.0	12.5
10-14	6.1	4.9	12.2	76.0	0.8	100.0	23.2
15-17	8.7	5.5	15.1	70.0	0.7	100.0	29.3
Sex of Head							
Male headed	2.8	2.9	3.2	90.8	0.4	100.0	8.9
Female Headed	5.9	2.9	24.5	65.3	1.3	100.0	33.4
Uganda	3.5	2.9	8.3	84.7	0.6	100.0	14.7

*Those who did not state parental survival status were excluded

1.1 million
Households had
at least one
orphan

11.2.2.1 Number of Orphans per Household

The distribution of number of orphans per household provides useful information for program managers and implementers for orphans especially those charged with the role of strengthening the capacity of families that care for orphans. The survey results show that in Uganda, out of the 5.1 million households in the country, about 1.1 million had an orphan, representing 21.2 percent. Table 11.6 shows that among households which had orphans, half of them had one orphan compared to 24 percent with two orphans. This shows that there is a likelihood that orphans in Uganda do not live with their siblings. Thirteen percent of the households had 4 or more orphans.

Households
headed by older
persons had the
highest
percentage of
orphans

As expected, the distribution of households with orphans by age of household head reveals that households headed by older persons are more likely to have 4 or more orphans. Regional sub grouping show that for those households with 4 or more orphans, the Northern region had the highest percentage (16%) compared to the Western region (11%)

Table 11.6: Distribution Households with Orphans by Number of Orphans (%)

Characteristics of Households	Number of Orphans				Total
	1	2	3	4+	
Sex of Household Head					
Male	59.2	22.0	11.1	7.6	100.0
Female	39.7	25.9	14.9	19.6	100.0
Age of HH Head					
Less than 30	61.2	19.6	12.5	6.7	100.0
31-59	49.0	24.6	12.9	13.6	100.0
60+	45.1	24.9	13.3	16.8	100.0
HH by Region					
Kampala	62.1	22.1	9.2	6.7	100.0
Central	55.4	21.2	10.9	12.6	100.0
Eastern	48.6	24.6	12.1	14.8	100.0
Northern	44.8	23.6	14.8	16.9	100.0
Western	46.0	27.3	15.6	11.2	100.0
Total Households with Orphans	50.1	23.8	12.9	13.2	100.0
Total No. Of HH's with Orphans ('000)	558.1	265.7	143.9	147.4	1,115.1

11.2.2.2 Role of Surviving Parents

The family is usually the basic unit for the growth and development of children. A strong family unit with a caring adult is a pre-requisite for the integration of orphans and other vulnerable children. The survey results provide information on the role of

surviving parents in caring for orphans as shown in Table 11.7. The results reveal that mothers were more likely to be care givers (35%). This is attributed to low

percentage of maternal orphanhood as observed in Table 11.5 compared to paternal orphanhood.

45 percent of the children without parents, lived with their grandparents

It can also be observed that children whose parents were alive but living with only one parent were more likely to be with their mothers (13%) compared to their fathers (5%). Nearly one in every four orphans was living with his/her grandparent(s). The results further show that 45 percent of children without both parents were more likely to live with their grandparents.

Table 11.7: Distribution of Children, 0-17 by Orphanhood Status and Living Arrangements (%)

Care giver	Both Alive	Both Dead	Only Father Alive	Only Mother Alive	All Orphans	Don't Know	All Children
Both Parents	70.7	-	-	-	-	-	56.9
Father only	4.6	-	-	46.2	9.3	-	5.0
Mother only	12.5	-	62.6	-	34.9	26.4	15.1
Grand parent	7.1	44.7	16.3	21.5	24.3	44.3	10.6
Brother/sisters	0.9	10.3	4.4	5.9	6.1	0.8	1.8
Others	4.2	45.0	16.7	26.4	25.4	28.5	10.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

11.2.3 Working Children and Child Labour

Uganda is a signatory to the 1990 UN Convention on the rights of the child and the ILO International Programme of the Elimination of child labour. According to the ILO⁴⁶, not all work performed by children is equivalent to “child labour”. Work in the sense of economic activity is a statistical definition. The concept is therefore based on minimum age of entry into the labour force, non hazardous work and worst forms of child labour. The ILO convention on minimum age exempts children from 12 to 13 years old only if they are engaged in light work. Thus all children 5 to 11 years working in economic activities are considered to be in child labour. Article 34 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) prohibits child labour. Despite all these commitments, child labour still exists in the country.

The survey collected information on the working population to include all persons aged 5 years and above whose activity status was paid employee, self employed or unpaid family worker, during the 7 days that preceded the survey. The analysis on child labour was derived using the following classifications;

⁴⁶ ILO, “Every Child Counts, New Global Estimates of Child Labour”, 2002

- Children aged 5-11 years who did any work (including household work) and those who worked for more than 14 hours in a week
- Children aged 12-14 years who worked for more than 14 hours in a week
- Children aged 15-17 who worked for more than 43 hours in a week
- Children 5-17 who worked in the mining and construction industries

32% of children 5-17 years were economically active

The results in Table 11.8 show the proportion of working children and child labourers by region. It is indicated that 32 percent of the children aged 5-17 in Uganda were working, with slightly higher percentages for males than females. The Central region had the highest proportion of 40 percent followed by the Eastern region with 36 percent.

16% of children were child labourers

Table 11.8 further shows that, overall, 16 percent of the children aged 5-17 years were child labourers with males having slightly higher rates (17%) than females (14%). Regional variations show that the Northern region exhibited the lowest percentage of child labourers (9%) while Central region had the highest percentage (21%).

Table 11.8: Characteristics of Working Children and Child Labourers (5-17) Years by Region (%)


Characteristics	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Working Children						
Male	12.6	40.7	38.0	23.8	34.7	33.8
Female	8.1	40.0	34.7	19.1	33.1	31.1
Both Sexes	10.3	40.4	36.3	21.4	33.9	32.4
Child Labourers						
Male	9.1	21.9	19.3	10.8	16.8	17.1
Female	4.6	20.9	16.2	6.6	13.3	14.1
Both Sexes	6.8	21.4	17.8	8.7	15.0	15.6

11.2.4 All Vulnerable Children

Vulnerable groups of children can be classified according to existing information collected from the UNHS 2005/06. Although the definition of vulnerable children may be wider in scope, the results displayed in Appendix I show selected categories of vulnerable children by; orphanhood, children who are not attending school, child labourers, idle children, children living in poor households, children living in child headed households, children with adult responsibilities (heading households, children who are married) and children with a disability.

Figure 11.3 shows that, overall, 65 percent of the children aged 0-17 years were vulnerable. The Northern region had the highest proportion of vulnerable children (80%), while the Western region had the lowest percentage (56%).

Figure 11.3: Vulnerable Children by Region (%)



11.3 Older Persons

In Uganda like in the rest of Africa, the family is still the most Central institution for caring for older persons⁴⁷. Older persons are generally too weak to perform productive work and are economically dependent on others, i.e. children, relatives, neighbors to survive. Some of them are faced with challenges of looking after grandchildren especially orphans.

Programs and policies for older persons are enshrined in the 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (article 32) which states that “the state shall make reasonable provision for the welfare and maintenance of the elderly”. Despite this effort, there is no explicit and comprehensive National Policy for the older persons to date to guide and ensure their sustainable protection and care, welfare and inclusion of older persons, in the national development process.

⁴⁷ An older person in Uganda, is one who is aged 60 years and above.

One in every two older persons had never been to school

Results in Table 11.9 show that there were about 1.2 million older persons in the country of which 53 percent were females. One in every ten older persons lives in urban areas. Education characteristics show that more than half of the older persons had never been to school. About 79 percent of the female older persons were illiterate compared to 41 percent of the male. The proportion engaged in economic activities was close to three quarters with slight gender differentials in favor of men. Disability rates for female older persons were much higher than those for the entire population. More than 40 percent of the older persons had a disability with gender differentials in favor of men.

Table 11.9: Selected Characteristics of Older Persons (aged 60+) by Sex (%)

Characteristic	Male	Female	Uganda
Total Population of Older Persons	562,283	634,156	1,196,439
Percent of the total population	4.2	4.6	4.4
Percent living in urban areas	9.1	10.9	10.0
Percent who are economically active	79.1	70.2	74.4
Percent who are employed in the Agriculture Sector	85.6	94.6	90.1
Percent who head Households	89.5	52.8	70.1
Percent who have a Disability	42.7	45.2	44.0
Percent who have never been to School	30.7	70.6	51.8
Percent who are illiterate	41.1	78.8	61.0
Percent living in Single person households	15.8	12.5	14.0
Percent who are widowed	11.7	59.7	37.1
Percent living in Households that experienced Shocks in the last 5 years	61.3	37.3	48.6

11.4 Widows

In most Ugandan societies, widows tend to be poor because of asymmetries in intra household power relations resulting in unequal access to and control over physical and financial resources. Through cultural inheritance laws, in-laws tend to strip the husband's family leaving the widow without a home and assets including land. In most instances widows with large number of children to take care of are more likely to be vulnerable.

Two in every three widows lived in single person households

Results in Table 11.10 show that the total population of widows was about 780,000 which represents about 6 percent of the total female population aged 15 years and above. Subsistence farming remains the main economic activity for widows, with about eight in every ten of those engaged in economic activities, working as subsistence farmers. Two thirds of the widows were in single person households, while 75 percent were household heads. All these indicators are reflective of

vulnerability at both household and individual levels. These findings are supported by the qualitative module where widows were reported losing their property especially land and other productive assets.

Table 11.10: Selected Characteristics of Widows (aged 15+) (%)

Characteristic	Uganda
Total Population of Widows	779,832
Percent of the total female population	5.6
Percent living in urban areas	13.5
Percent who are economically active	77.9
Percent who are engaged in Subsistence Farming	84.9
Percent who head Households	75.4
Percent who have a Disability	34.1
Percent who have never been to School	54.1
Percent who are illiterate	68.3
Percent living in Single person households	67.5
Percent living in Households that experienced Shocks in the last 5 years	58.2

11.5 Persons with Disabilities

Generally Persons With Disabilities (PWDs) are vulnerable by virtue of their impairment and negative societal attitudes arising from fear, ignorance and lack of awareness⁴⁸. Accessing mainstream programmes remains a challenge for PWDs, as a result of negative attitudes which often lead to social exclusion and marginalization. According to the qualitative module, stigma and discrimination are highlighted as some of the problems of PWDs. This discrimination and stigma extend to denying PWDs the chance to participate in community activities such as leadership.

Government efforts to overcome these problems include the development of the National Disability Policy whose main objective among others is “to create a conducive environment for participation of PWDs and promote effective friendly service delivery to PWDs and their caregivers”. The numbers and types of PWDs is essential during the operationalisation of the policy. This information was collected from the UNHS 2005/06 by asking every household member whether he/she has a difficulty with seeing, hearing or communication among others.

Table 11.11 shows the disability rates for selected age groups. Overall, 7 percent of Uganda’s population had a disability. For those persons aged 5 years and

7 % of Uganda’s population had a disability

⁴⁸ MGLSD, National Disability Policy, February 2006, pg 3


above, the disability rate was 8 percent and further increased to 9 percent for those aged 10 years and above.

Table 11.11 : Disability Rates by Sex and Broad Age (%)

Disability Status	5 years and above			10 years and above			All ages		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Yes	8.5	8.3	8.4	9.5	9.3	9.4	7.3	7.1	7.2
No	91.5	91.7	91.6	90.5	90.7	90.6	92.7	92.9	92.8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% with a Disability	8.5	8.3	8.4	9.5	9.3	9.4	7.3	7.1	7.2

Figure 11.4 further reveals that disability increases with increasing age. The disability rates were less than 5 percent for children below 9 years. The percentage increased to about 10 percent for person with ages 40-44 years. The results further showed that sex differentials are observed for those aged 49 years and above.

Figure 11.4: Disability Rates by Age group and Sex (%)



11.5.1 Multiple Disabilities

The survey collected information on multiple disabilities. Among the 1.5 million persons with disabilities, 20 percent had a second disability. The results in Table 11.12 show that among PWDs with a hearing difficulty, 3 in every 10 persons reported having sight problems. Of those with sight problems, 42 percent reported

20 percent of PWDs had multiple disabilities

mobility problems while 45 percent reported hearing problems as their second difficulty.

Table 11.12 : Distribution of Persons with Multiple Disabilities (%)

Disability Type	Seeing	Hearing	Mobility Problems	Communication	Others	Total
Seeing	0.0	45.0	41.6	0.0	13.4	100
Hearing	33.5	0.0	21.0	30.2	15.3	100
Taking part in social	14.1	6.0	31.3	15.9	32.7	100
Personal care	12.0	0.0	45.4	8.6	34.1	100
Others	11.4	8.5	30.2	4.0	46.0	100
Uganda	17.3	20.9	25.9	7.9	27.9	100

11.5.2 Selected Characteristics of Persons with a Disability

The National Disability Policy highlights some of the major concerns of PWDs as limited skills and employment due to scarcity of appropriate educational scholastic and instructional materials. Other concerns include poverty, limited access to health and social security services.

Adoption of the standard rules by the General Assembly, on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities was among the major outcomes of the Decade of Disabled Persons in 1993. The rules serve as an instrument for policy-making and as a basis for technical and economic cooperation. At national level, the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995 provides for fair representation and recognition of PWDs in all spheres of society. In order to enhance the role of Government and other policy makers to take affirmative action to redress any imbalances that may exist against PWDs, a set of background indicators for PWDs and those without is provided in Table 11.13. The data in each column is analyzed in such a way that the indicators for PWDs are derived independently of those for non PWDs. Therefore the percentages may not necessarily add up to 100.

The results in Table 11.13 show that there exist varying age structures for PWDs and those without. Among all PWDs, children (aged less than 18 years) constituted 31 percent, while for persons without disabilities, children constituted about 60 percent. The Proportions for those aged 31 to 59 years and older persons was lower for non PWDs than those for PWDs.

Variations by place of residence show that 12 percent of the PWDs resided in urban areas compared to 16 percent of those without disabilities. Education characteristics show that among the population aged 6-24 years, 80 percent of the PWDs were attending primary school which was less similar to the proportion of those persons without disabilities (81%). Similarly among the population out of

school, aged 13 years and above, 65 percent of the PWDs had not completed primary level, compared to 53 percent of the population without disabilities.

The National Disability Policy highlights disability as both a cause and consequence of poverty. The policy further notes that disability exposes people to limited livelihood opportunities which consequently lead them to poverty. Classification of PWDs and non PWDs heads of households by Household welfare ranking shows that 29 percent of the households headed by PWDs were in the lowest or poorest quintile compared to 18 percent of those households headed by persons without disabilities. The results show that generally, the households headed by persons without disabilities were wealthier than those for PWDs.

Table 11.13 Selected Characteristics of Persons with and without a Disability

Characteristics	Persons with a Disability	Persons without a Disability
Age Group		
0-17 (Children)	31.4	59.2
18-30 (Youth)	14.4	20.3
31-59	26.4	17.8
60+ (Older persons)	27.8	2.7
Rural/Urban		
Rural	88.4	84.3
Urban	11.8	15.7
Current Schooling Status (6-24 years)		
Primary	80.4	80.9
Secondary and above	17.5	16.1
Never been to school	15.4	6.2
Education attainment for those out school (13+)		
Some Primary	64.7	53.2
Primary 7	12.6	17.9
Secondary and above	22.2	28.5
Employment by sector (14-64) (for those working)		
Primary	78.6	74.5
Manufacturing	4.6	4.1
Service	16.8	21.3
Household Welfare Ranking by Disability Status of Head		
Lowest quintile	29.4	17.9
Second lowest quintile	19.2	20.6
Middle quintile	17.3	20.2
Second highest quintile	18.1	20.9
Highest quintile	16.0	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0

11.5.3 Rehabilitation of Persons with a Disability

The rehabilitation process for PWDs includes a wide range of actions that may include measures to provide and/or restore functions, or compensate for the loss or absence of a function or for a functional limitation. The results in Table 11.14 show that close to 6 in every 10 PWDs had not received any kind of rehabilitation. Among those who received rehabilitation measures, medication accounted for over 80 percent of the services received. Provision of rehabilitation measures by a traditional healer accounted for 5 percent of the PWDs who received some form of rehabilitation measure.

Table 11.14: Rehabilitation of Persons with Disability (%)

Type of Rehabilitation received (for those who received services)	Percent
Medication	84.9
Spiritual/Traditional healer	5.4
Surgical operation	3.7
Others	8.0
Percent of PWDs with no Rehabilitation	58.1

11.5.4 Ability for PWDs to Work and Attend School

The rights of persons with disabilities have been the subject of much attention in the United Nations and other international organizations over a long period of time. The ability for PWDs to work or attend school is a reflection of the existence of basic infrastructure for PWDs in the country. The UNHS 2005/06 collected information on the ability of PWDs to work or attend school. The analysis focused on persons aged 6 -24 years for school attendance and 14-64 years for the ability to work.

The results in Table 11.15 show that 13 percent of the PWDs were not limited by their difficulties to attend school, compared to 41 percent who reported that they were affected all the time. Six in every ten PWDs with sight difficulties, reported that they were affected all the time. Persons with personal care problems were less likely to experience non school attendance compared to those with sight difficulties.

41 % of the PWDs were affected all the time, in attending school

Among PWDs aged 14 to 64 years, about 46 percent reported that they were affected in participating in employment activities while 8 percent revealed that they were not at all affected. PWDs with learning difficulties were more likely to engage in employment activities than those with a hearing difficulty.

46 % of the PWDs aged 14-64, were affected in participating in employment activities

Table 11.15 : Distribution of Persons with Disabilities aged 6-24 years by Ability to attend School or Work (%)

Disability Type	Affected all the time	Affected sometimes	Not Affected	Not Available	Total
Ability to Attend School (6-24 Years)					
Seeing	59.8	22.0	3.1	15.2	100.0
Mobility problems	47.2	36.3	6.4	10.1	100.0
Hearing	34.6	40.9	14.8	9.8	100.0
Taking part in social	12.0	62.0	21.2	4.8	100.0
Communication	36.3	18.0	32.5	13.3	100.0
Psychological emotional	22.1	44.5	17.8	15.6	100.0
Personal care	22.6	39.1	31.1	7.2	100.0
Other	28.6	40.3	21.6	9.5	100.0
Learning	20.1	55.7	18.4	5.8	100.0
Total (6-24)Years	41.2	34.4	12.9	11.5	100.0
Ability to work (14-64 Years)					
Seeing	55.2	36.9	6.5	1.4	100.0
Mobility problems	37.4	51.1	9.6	1.9	100.0
Hearing	65.9	26.6	4.0	3.5	100.0
Taking part in social	16.3	71.8	8.9	3.1	100.0
Psychological emotional	27.5	53.4	16.6	2.6	100.0
Communication	19.0	72.7	8.3	0.0	100.0
Other	42.6	37.5	19.1	0.8	100.0
Personal care	33.0	44.3	11.7	11.1	100.0
Learning	27.0	39.5	26.5	7.0	100.0
Total (14-64 Years)	45.8	43.6	8.3	2.3	100.0

11.6 Summary of Findings

This chapter highlights some of the major indicators for vulnerability at household and individual levels. A profile of selected vulnerable groups, for instance, widows, children, older persons, persons with disabilities was also included. The survey results show that nearly two thirds of all households experienced at least one type of shock. Rural households suffered from mostly shocks related to agriculture. The median duration of the most serious shock lasted 4 months and use of savings ranked highest as a mitigation measure. In addition reducing consumption was the main coping mechanism for those households that experienced agriculture shocks. There is need for further analysis of the data to investigate the behavior of

households once they experience shocks. This is the first time such data is collected at national level. The study needs to focus on the probability of a household becoming poor, once it experiences a certain type of shock. The information is important for the policy makers and stakeholders.

Orphans and other vulnerable children constitute 45 percent of the total child population. The Orphanhood rate was 15 percent while, 18 percent of the children aged 5-17 were engaged in child labour activities.

The national disability rate was 7 percent, of which 20 percent had multiple disabilities. Forty one percent of PWDs aged 6-24 years attending school declared that they were affected all the time. For those PWDs aged 14-64 years, 46 percent reported that they were affected in participating in employment activities.

The MGLSD has defined OVCs in both the NSPPI and the NOP. The results show that not all indicators in the data set do provide detailed information on child labour. There is need to undertake fully fledged surveys for OVCs and include special surveys to capture those children in institutions like prisons, orphanages and street children, children in conflict with the law. The data from children's institutions should be routinely collected and published annually.

Chapter Twelve

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

12.0 Introduction

The UNHS 2005/06 had a community module in addition to the Socio-economic and agricultural modules. The community questionnaire was administered at Local Council 1 (LC1) level in the selected enumeration areas (EAs). In EAs which comprised of more than one LC1, only one was randomly selected and this represented the other LCs. The issues discussed at community level included community access to different facilities like education, health, transport, communication and banking. Also covered in the community module were the available community services and amenities in addition to the economic infrastructure and the availability of different types of markets in the Communities.

In addition to the above, information was collected from schools, health facilities and agricultural technology services in those particular villages (LCs). The information was collected from knowledgeable opinion leaders in the Communities, head teachers, medical personnel and agricultural extension workers. The communities were distributed as follows; 77 percent were in rural areas whereas the remaining 23 percent were in urban. The chapter presents highlights in relation to the above mentioned issues.

12.1 Education Facilities

The community survey covered the availability of education facilities during the time of the survey and also asked the status of the facilities in 2001. The results in Table 12.1 show that 34 percent of the Communities reported having a Government primary school in their vicinity during 2005/06 as compared to 31 percent in 2001. However, there were notable differences in the availability of government primary schools between urban and rural Communities.

**1 in every 3
Communities
reported
availability of
Government
primary schools in
their vicinity**

Table 12.1: Availability of Education Facilities by Residence (%)

Education Facilities	2001			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Government Primary School	31.4	25.3	30.6	27.6	35.2	34.2
Private Primary School	10.9	45.3	15.4	13.4	48.5	18.9
Pre-Primary School	22.2	58.6	27.3	27.8	60.8	32.4
Government Secondary School	3.0	8.9	3.8	3.1	8.8	3.9
Private Secondary School	7.9	30.6	10.9	7.9	31.8	11.1

The results further reveal that urban Communities were more likely to have private primary schools (49%) compared to the rural (13%). Also notable, is that pre-primary schools are predominant in urban areas (61%) as compared to rural (28%). The proportion of Government secondary schools is still very low in the Communities (4%) as compared to private secondary schools which were at 11 percent. Western region had the highest percentage of Communities with Government primary schools (41%) as compared to Kampala which had only 15 percent as shown in Table 12.2.

Table 12.2: Availability of Education Facilities by Region (%)

Education Facilities	Region (2005/06)				
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western
Government Primary School	15.3	33.5	35.8	27.8	40.6
Private Primary School	61.5	34.6	8.8	2.7	13.5
Pre-Primary School	67.5	53.6	25.8	5.4	30.6
Government Secondary School	11.4	2.1	4.3	0.9	4.7
Private Secondary School	34.0	18.0	8.1	2.5	8.8

12.1.1 Distance to Education Facilities

The survey also sought to know the average distance from the center of the community to the nearest education facilities. There was no significant difference between the distance to Government and private secondary schools as indicated in Table 12.3. It was noted that the average distance to nearest Government primary school was 2km. The average distance in rural Communities was 2 kilometers whereas for urban Communities it was 1 kilometer.

Average distance to the nearest Government primary school was 2km

Table 12.3: Distance to Nearest School Facility from the Centre of LC1 by Residence (Km)

Education Facility	2005/06		Uganda
	Rural	Urban	
Government Primary School	2.3	1.2	2.2
Private Primary School	11.6	5.7	11.1
Pre-Primary School	7.1	1.5	6.6
Government Secondary School	8.3	2.8	7.7
Private Secondary School	8.8	4.1	8.3

12.2 Health Facilities

Under the Health Sector Strategic Plan (HSSP), emphasis has been put on, Government to upgrade infrastructure, abolish user fees in public facilities, provide subsidies to the not-for-profit sector, and upgrade training and enhance drug availability. The community survey collected information on the available health facilities in the Communities at the time of the survey and also facilities that were there in 2001.

One third of the Communities had access to private clinics in their LC1

The results show that there has been no much change in the availability of the respective health facilities since 2001 with the exception of private clinics. The proportion of Communities which had private clinics increased by three percentage points from 2001 to 2005/06 as shown in Table 12.4. The 2005/06 results reveal that nationally, amongst the selected facilities, more Communities had private clinics (27%) than the Government Health Units (7%) and Government Hospitals. Communities with private clinics in the urban areas (59%) were more than those in the rural areas (22%) by almost more than double. Interestingly the facilities of both traditional healers (63%) and traditional birth attendants (67%) were common within Communities in Uganda.

Table 12.4: Availability of Health Facilities by Residence (%)

Health Facilities	2001			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Health Unit Government	5.5	5.9	5.6	6.7	6.9	6.7
Government Hospital	0.2	1.5	0.4	0.2	1.5	0.4
NGO Health Unit	1.9	8.0	2.7	2.1	8.1	3.0
NGO Hospital	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3
Private Clinic	18.8	58.1	24.0	21.8	58.9	26.7
Pharmacy	3.2	11.2	4.2	3.5	11.9	4.6
Traditional Healer	61.8	66.6	62.4	63.2	64.4	63.4
Traditional Birth attendant	69.3	58.2	67.7	70.6	58.2	67.0

Average distance to the nearest Government health unit was 7 km

12.2.1 Distance to Health Facilities

The community survey also collected information on the average distance to the nearest health facilities as shown in Table 12.5. The results show that on average, Communities had to cover a distance of about 7km to seek treatment from a Government health centre. Much as several Communities reported having private clinics in their areas, the average distance to the nearest private clinic was 8 km and residents of Northern region had to cover 15 km to the private clinics as compared to Kampala where only one km would be covered. It is also worth noting that the average distance to the nearest Government hospital was about 26 km at national level. However, the average distance from the LC 1 centre in Northern region to the nearest Government hospital was 32 km.

Table 12.5: Distance to Health Facility by Region (Km)


Health Facilities	Region (2005/06)					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Health Unit	0.0	7.8	6.2	4.2	9.2	6.7
Government Hospital	5.4	25.8	19.6	31.8	29.9	25.6
NGO Health Unit	2.0	15.0	8.6	13.5	12.6	12.2
NGO Hospital	3.6	34.7	21.6	39.4	37.3	31.9
Private Clinic	1.0	4.3	4.6	15.3	6.5	8.0
Pharmacy	2.8	20.7	19.1	35.8	27.7	24.8
Traditional Healer	1.8	6.5	5.3	7.0	7.9	6.7
Traditional Birth attendant	0.7	2.9	2.7	2.0	3.0	2.7

Three quarters of the Communities reported walking as most common mode of transport to Government health facilities

12.2.2 Mode of Transport to Government Health Facilities

The most common mode of transport by the communities to a Government health facility was walking (77%). Fourteen percent of the Communities used bicycles while the remaining proportion used Boda Boda and others.

Figure 12.1: Mode of Transport to the Nearest Government Health Unit




12.2.3 Common Source of Medicine in LC1

57 percent of the Communities bought medicine

Information was collected on the most common source of medicine in the community. Fifty seven percent of the Communities reported that they got medicine through buying. Only 42 percent received medicine free of charge from Government hospitals/clinics as shown in Figure 12.2.

Figure 12.2: Communities reporting the most common Source of Medicine



12.2.4 Condoms and Other Family Planning Methods

The Communities were asked about the availability of condoms and other family planning services in their areas at the time of the survey and what the situation was in 2001. The results in Table 12.6 indicate that 61 percent of the Communities reported availability of condoms in their villages during survey time as compared to 57 percent in 2001. On the availability of other family planning methods, 54 percent reported availability while the figure for 2001 was 50 percent. Urban Communities were better off as far as availability of these family planning services are concerned as compared to rural Communities.

Table 12.6: Availability of Condoms and Other Family Planning Methods by Residence (%)

Family Planning Method	2001			2005/06		
	Rural	Urban	Uganda	Rural	Urban	Uganda
Condoms	53.9	73.9	56.5	58.5	76.7	60.9
Other Family Planning Methods	47.6	62.2	49.5	51.8	64.5	53.5

12.3 Availability of Transport Facilities

Over 70 percent of the Communities reported availability of usable feeder roads in the dry season as given in Table 12.7. These were more pronounced in Central region (87%) than in Northern region where only 46 percent of the Communities reported having dry season feeder roads. The Communities also reported availability of all season feeder roads (66%). Out of the total number of Communities visited, 15 percent reported that buses stopped in their areas.

Table 12.7: Transport Facilities by Region (%)

Facilities	Region (2005/06)					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Dry season feeder roads	69.1	87.1	81.9	45.5	79.0	75.0
All season feeder roads	78.5	81.0	61.0	48.9	66.4	65.9
Trunk road Murrum	53.4	46.7	40.3	21.7	36.6	38.0
Trunk road tarmac	47.6	13.8	8.8	9.1	7.6	12.0
Bus stop	4.0	12.6	20.1	11.5	15.6	14.6
Taxi/Matatu stop	64.1	38.0	26.7	22.0	38.4	34.4
Railway stop	3.2	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.6

15 percent of the Communities have bus stops in their LC1s.

One in every two Communities has access to telephone services.

12.4 Communication and Banking Facilities

Nationally, only one percent of the Communities had access to post offices in their LC1s but close to half of the Communities reported having access to telephone facilities as shown in Table 12.8. Telephone services were more common in Western and Central regions (59% and 56% respectively) than in Northern region where only 12 percent had access to the services. Banking facilities were almost not available in all the Communities. Only four percent of the Communities reported presence of micro credit institutions in their Communities.

Table 12.8: Communication and Banking Facilities by Region (%)

Facilities	Region (2005/06)					Uganda
	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Post office	0.0	1.2	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.1
Telephone Service	100.0	55.6	40.2	12.1	59.1	48.5
Bank branch Office	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.4
Micro credit institution	0.0	3.9	4.6	0.2	7.5	4.3

12.5 Community Services and Other Amenities


The survey collected information on a number of community services that were available. These included access to safe drinking water, electricity services, source of medicine, family planning, community meetings and community problems. This section gives some highlights on some of these.

12.5.1 Access to safe drinking water

59 percent of the Communities had access to safe drinking water

The results reveal that 59 percent of the Communities had access to safe drinking water in 2005/06 as compared to 56 percent in 2001 as shown in Figure 12.3. The distribution was uneven within the urban and rural Communities with 95 percent in urban Communities reporting access as compared to 54 percent in rural areas during the 2005/06 survey period. Central region had better access to safe drinking water (66%) than all other regions whereas Northern had the lowest proportion (51%). It is also worth noting that availability of safe drinking water for all regions increased between 2001 and 2005/06 with exception of the Northern region.

Figure 12.3: Distribution of Communities with Access to Safe Drinking Water by Residence (%)




12.5.2 Availability of Electricity at community level

Cooking and lighting energy constitute a big proportion of total energy used in rural areas and most of the Communities in the country are rural based. The survey sought to know the proportion of Communities that had access to electric energy inside their dwellings. The question sought to know what the status was as compared to 2001. It is important to note that this was the perception of the respondents who answered the community questionnaire and not necessarily that of individual households.

The 2005/06 results show that 20 percent of the Communities reported that they had electricity inside some dwellings as shown in Figure 12.4. The corresponding percentages for urban and rural were 87 percent and 9 percent respectively.

20 percent of the communities had electricity inside some of their dwellings

Figure 12.4: Distribution of Communities that reported having Electricity Services (%)




One in four Communities reported lack of safe water as the major problem

12.5.3 Community Problems

It is important to know the most common problems in Communities to see what interventions can be put in place. A question was asked about the three major problems in the villages and these were ranked in order of importance. It was noted that a number of Communities reported that lack of safe water was the major problem (28%) as shown in Figure 12.5. A reasonable proportion (18%) reported poverty as the problem whereas 16 percent reported lack of health facilities as a major problem. Close to 40 percent of the Communities reported having at least one of the other problems like roads, employment, famine, sanitation, agricultural inputs, insecurity, schools, permanent source of water and markets for produce.

Figure 12.5: Distribution of Major problems reported by Communities (%)



12.6 Access to Markets

The survey collected information on access to markets. Poor access to markets is a major obstacle to reducing poverty in rural areas of developing countries, where there is inadequate infrastructure, high transport costs and limited market information. The community survey collected information on general consumer markets, agricultural input markets and agricultural producer markets and it is given in Table 12.9.

The Communities reported presence of a number of markets in their LC Is with about 55 percent mentioning that they had at least a consumer market though limited to products. Northern region Communities reported that 64 percent had access to consumer markets as compared to 49 percent in Eastern region.

55 percent of the Communities had access to consumer markets.

Table 12.9: Distribution of Markets in Communities by Region (%)

Type of Market	Region (2005/06)				Uganda
	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Limited Consumer	61.7	49.3	64.1	57.2	55.3
Periodic Local	11.6	15.3	16.6	8.8	11.8
Most common institution	16.9	22.0	8.2	15.2	16.0
Other general	67.9	0.3	0.5	44.3	11.4

12.7 Summary of Findings

The Community survey has a number of interesting findings and these have been useful in providing some information to backup some of the findings from the Socio-economic module. There exists some trend in the responses from households as compared to Communities. It is noted for example that the indicator for the proportion of households with access to safe drinking water was found to be 66 percent and the same proportion was reported from the Communities.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Appleton, S. (2001 a) "Changes in Poverty in Uganda, 1992-1997", Chapter in P. Collier and R. Reinikka (eds) "Firms, households and Government in Uganda's recovery", World Bank: Washington DC
2. Appleton, S. (2001 b) "Poverty in Uganda, 1999/00: Preliminary estimates from UNHS", mimeo, School of Economics, University of Nottingham: Nottingham.
3. Appleton, S. and S. Ssewanyana (2003) "Poverty estimates from the Uganda National Household Survey II, 2002/03", mimeo, Economic Policy Research Center
4. Datt, G. and M. Ravallion (1992), "Growth and redistribution components of changes in poverty measures: A decomposition with application to Brazil and India in the 1980s", *Journal of Development Economics* 38: 275-295.
5. Foster, J., Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E. (1984), "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures", *Econometrica*, 52: 761-6
6. International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), Cairo, 1994
7. International Labour Organization, Key Indicators of Labour market, 3rd edition, 2003
8. Jappelli, T. (1990) Who is credit constrained in US economy? Quarterly Journal of Economics, 105, 219-234
9. Jappelli, T. and Pagano, M. (1994) Consumption and Capital Market imperfections: An international comparison. American Economic Review, 79, 1088-1105
10. Kakwani, N., (1990) "Statistical Inference in the Measurement of Poverty", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 75(4): 632-639.
11. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Millennium Development Goals, Country Progress Report, Uganda 2003.
12. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Eradication Action Plan 2004/5 – 2007/08 (PEAP), December 2004
13. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Status Report, 2005.
14. Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, National Disability Policy, February 2006.
15. Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, Social Development Sector Strategic Investment Plan for Development 2003-2008 (SDIP).
16. Ministry of Health, Health Sector Strategic Plan I, 2000-2005
17. Ministry of Health, Health Sector Strategic Plan II
18. Ministry of Health, National Center for Infectious Disease, Division of Parasitic Disease, April 2004

19. Muwanga Zaake , E.S.K, Transferring funds to Uganda: The Current Legal Ways and Issues, September 2004
20. Oakley, A (1997), A Brief History of Gender in Oakley,A. and Mitchell, J. (eds) Who is Afraid of Feminism? Seeing through the Backlash, Hamish Hamilton London.
21. Paul Mpuga, Demand for Credit in Rural Uganda, March 2004
22. Ravallion, Martin and Benu Bidani (1994), "How robust is a poverty line?" *World Bank Economic Review* 8(1): 75-102.
23. Susan Pfannenschmidt, et al , Family Health International for the Gender working group, Health and Nutrition Projects, October 1997
24. Uganda Bureau of Statistics & ORC Macro, Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2000/01.
25. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Report on Labour Market Conditions in Uganda 2006, July 2006.
26. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Uganda National Household Survey 2002/03 – Socio-economic Report, November 2003
27. United Nations New York, The Millennium Development Goals Report, May 2005
28. United Nations, 55th Session, United Nations Millennium Declaration, September 2000
29. World Bank 2001, Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources and Voice

APPENDIX I

Table A 1: (a) Poverty in the UNHS 2005/06 (excludes Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese and Bundibugyo)

Residence	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	84.7	34,900	32.2	8.7	3.4	94.4	94.8	95.0
Urban	15.3	75,500	10.6	2.7	1.0	5.6	5.2	5.0
Regions								
Central	32.1	57,600	16.4	3.6	1.3	18.2	14.9	13.6
Eastern	27.6	32,300	35.9	9.1	3.4	34.3	32.1	31.3
Northern	15.6	23,600	56.8	19.1	8.3	30.6	38.1	42.3
Western	24.8	40,400	19.7	4.7	1.6	16.9	15.0	12.8
Central rural	22.6	45,300	20.9	4.7	1.6	16.4	13.5	12.2
Central urban	9.4	87,200	5.5	1.1	0.5	1.8	1.3	1.4
Eastern rural	25.4	30,000	37.5	9.5	3.6	33.0	30.9	30.2
Eastern urban	2.2	59,300	16.9	4.4	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.1
Northern rural	13.7	21,600	60.4	20.5	8.9	28.6	35.8	40.1
Northern urban	1.9	38,300	31.3	9.2	3.5	2.1	2.3	2.2
Western rural	23.0	37,900	20.6	5.0	1.7	16.4	14.6	12.5
Western urban	1.8	73,700	7.4	1.8	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3
National	100.0	41,063	28.9	7.8	3.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A1: (b) Poverty in the UNHS 2002/03, 2002/03 (excludes Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese and Bundibugyo)

Residence	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	86.5	29,952	41.7	12.6	5.4	95.6	96.4	96.8
Urban	13.5	77,815	12.2	3.0	1.2	4.4	3.6	3.2
Region								
Central	31.6	52,747	22.3	5.5	1.9	18.7	15.3	12.8
Eastern	29.3	28,483	46.0	14.1	6.0	35.8	36.5	36.2
Western	23.7	34,459	31.4	7.9	2.9	19.8	16.5	14.3
Northern	15.3	21,015	63.3	23.4	11.6	25.8	31.7	36.8
Central rural	23.1	38,448	27.6	6.9	2.5	16.9	14.1	11.9
Central urban	8.6	91,196	7.8	1.6	0.5	1.8	1.2	0.8
Eastern rural	27.0	26,245	48.3	14.9	6.3	34.7	35.5	35.2
Eastern urban	2.3	55,047	17.9	4.8	2.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Western rural	21.8	32,234	32.7	8.2	3.0	18.9	15.7	13.6
Western urban	1.9	59,913	16.9	4.5	1.7	0.9	0.8	0.7
Northern rural	14.6	19,955	65.0	24.2	12.0	25.1	31.1	36.1
Northern urban	0.8	40,834	31.4	9.8	4.3	0.6	0.7	0.7
National	100.0	36,433	37.7	11.3	4.8	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A1: (c) Poverty in the UNHS 1999/00, 1999/00 (excluding Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese and Bundibugyo)

Residence	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	86.9	29,778	37.4	11.2	4.8	96.3	97.3	97.9
Urban	13.1	75,043	9.6	2.1	0.7	3.7	2.7	2.1
Region								
Central	28.9	50,270	19.7	4.4	1.5	16.9	12.8	10.0
Eastern	26.6	31,869	35.0	9.3	3.6	27.5	24.8	22.6
Western	25.4	34,408	26.2	6.1	2.1	19.7	15.6	12.4
Northern	19.0	20,637	63.7	24.6	12.3	35.9	46.9	55.1
Central rural	20.6	36,453	25.2	5.8	2.0	15.4	11.9	9.4
Central urban	8.4	84,266	6.1	1.0	0.3	1.5	0.8	0.6
Eastern rural	24.2	29,503	36.7	9.8	3.8	26.3	23.8	21.8
Eastern urban	2.4	56,141	17.1	4.2	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8
Western rural	23.9	31,973	27.4	6.4	2.2	19.4	15.4	12.3
Western urban	1.5	73,915	5.7	1.0	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
Northern rural	18.2	19,685	65.4	25.4	12.8	35.1	46.1	54.4
Northern urban	0.9	40,181	28.6	8.2	3.2	0.7	0.7	0.7
National	100.0	35,702	33.8	10.0	4.3	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A1 (d): Poverty in the IHS, 1992/93 (excluding Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, Kasese and Bundibugyo)

Residence	Pop. share	Mean CPAE	Poverty estimates			Contribution to:		
			P0	P1	P2	P0	P1	P2
Rural/Urban								
Rural	87.6	21,420	59.7	22.0	10.8	93.8	94.9	95.6
Urban	12.4	44,334	27.8	8.3	3.5	6.2	5.1	4.4
Region								
Central	30.6	31,172	45.6	15.3	7.0	25.1	23.1	21.8
Eastern	27.9	21,503	58.8	22.0	10.9	29.4	30.3	30.6
Western	24.2	22,679	53.1	18.7	9.0	23.0	22.3	22.0
Northern	17.3	18,696	72.2	28.6	14.6	22.4	24.4	25.6
Central rural	22.7	24,128	54.3	18.7	8.8	22.1	20.8	20.1
Central urban	8.0	51,214	20.8	5.7	2.2	3.0	2.2	1.7
Eastern rural	25.4	20,626	60.6	23.0	11.4	27.6	28.7	29.2
Eastern urban	2.5	30,359	40.4	12.6	5.5	1.8	1.6	1.4
Western rural	23.1	21,884	54.3	19.2	9.3	22.5	21.9	21.7
Western urban	1.1	39,733	28.9	7.3	2.6	0.6	0.4	0.3
Northern rural	16.5	18,268	73.0	29.0	14.8	21.6	23.5	24.7
Northern urban	0.8	26,997	55.2	21.2	10.9	0.8	0.9	0.9
National	100.0	24,262	55.7	20.3	9.9	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A 2: Statistical Tests on Poverty Headcount Index

	Prop. poor	Standard error	Confidence intervals		Deff
			Lower	Upper	
2005/06					
National	0.311	0.007	0.297	0.324	1.637
Rural	0.342	0.008	0.327	0.357	1.657
Urban	0.137	0.012	0.114	0.160	1.353
Central	0.164	0.012	0.141	0.187	2.210
Eastern	0.359	0.014	0.331	0.386	1.553
Northern	0.607	0.014	0.579	0.634	1.198
Western	0.205	0.012	0.181	0.229	1.744
Central rural	0.209	0.015	0.180	0.239	2.109
Central urban	0.055	0.015	0.025	0.085	2.896
Eastern rural	0.375	0.015	0.346	0.404	1.610
Eastern urban	0.169	0.025	0.121	0.218	0.632
Northern rural	0.642	0.015	0.612	0.671	1.251
Northern urban	0.397	0.032	0.333	0.460	0.910
Western rural	0.214	0.013	0.188	0.240	1.799
Western urban	0.093	0.018	0.057	0.128	0.574
2002/03					
National	0.388	0.007	0.374	0.403	2.249
Rural	0.427	0.008	0.411	0.443	2.353
Urban	0.144	0.009	0.125	0.162	0.941
Central	0.223	0.012	0.200	0.245	2.250
Eastern	0.460	0.014	0.431	0.488	2.239
Northern	0.630	0.017	0.597	0.662	2.127
Western	0.329	0.014	0.302	0.357	2.100
Central rural	0.276	0.015	0.247	0.305	2.332
Central urban	0.078	0.012	0.054	0.103	1.667
Eastern rural	0.483	0.016	0.453	0.514	2.371
Eastern urban	0.179	0.017	0.147	0.211	0.386
Northern rural	0.650	0.018	0.615	0.685	2.305
Northern urban	0.389	0.030	0.331	0.448	0.531
Western rural	0.343	0.015	0.313	0.373	2.222
Western urban	0.186	0.017	0.153	0.219	0.384

Table A 3: Comparison of Poverty Estimates

Survey year		P0	P1	P2
2002/03	Our consumption aggregate estimate	31.08	8.75	3.53
	With allowance for measurement error	31.09	9.83	4.67
2005/06	Our consumption aggregate estimate	38.82	11.87	5.10
	With allowance for measurement error	38.10	14.69	8.43

Notes: We assume a measurement error with a standard error as big as a tenth of the standard error of our observed consumption aggregate (consumption expenditure per adult equivalent). Then we run poverty estimates between our consumption aggregate and new consumption aggregate after taking into account the possible measurement (due to recall problems, refusal etc). These two estimates are compared to provide insights into the extent of the measurement error problem with our estimates.

Table A 4: Welfare Indicators by Wealth quintile

WELFARE INDICATORS	Quintiles				
	Lowest	2 nd Lowest	Middle	2 nd Highest	Highest
Every member of household has two sets of clothes	73.1	82.5	90.1	92.5	96.5
Every child under 18 years has a blanket	20.4	23.8	31.7	34.7	60.0
Every member has at least a pair of shoes	27.0	37.1	46.0	59.1	79.2
Proportion having one meal a day	20.5	10.7	5.3	3.6	2.8
Action taken when Household last run out salt					
Borrowed from neighbor	38.8	36.3	33.3	25.4	13.5
Bought	56.0	60.8	65.1	73.2	85.4
Did without	5.3	2.8	1.6	1.4	1.1
Breakfast for children under 5 years					
Tea/drink (with or without sugar) and solid food	16.9	24.7	30.3	31.0	28.7
Milk/Milk tea with sugar	2.5	5.4	8.8	16.3	27.0
Porridge (with or without sugar) and solid food	28.7	26.0	25.1	24.6	19.5
Porridge with milk	1.3	2.0	2.8	4.0	7.8
Solid food only	20.8	18.1	12.7	9.2	4.0
Nothing	19.4	14.0	11.2	6.5	3.3
Household member on either LCI, LCII or LCIII committee	7.9	11.4	15.0	16.9	20.8
Ownership of Assets					
House	83.5	81.5	79.2	77.8	80.1
Furniture	74.0	89.1	93.4	97.2	98.0
Furnishings	94.5	97.0	97.9	98.8	99.5
Bed nets	15.3	21.4	24.3	32.4	51.8
Household appliances	22.8	29.1	35.7	42.3	62.1
Electronic equipment	30.8	53.2	65.5	78.0	89.9
Generators	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	1.9
Solar panel/electric inverters	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3	1.7
Bicycle	20.2	35.5	45.0	46.1	48.8
Motor cycle	0.3	0.3	0.8	2.8	8.6
Other transport equipment	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	6.8
Jewry and watches	10.4	19.0	31.1	39.7	65.3
Mobile phone	1.1	3.5	8.2	19.2	51.9
Savings account with a formal institution	1.0	2.9	8.1	16.5	44.3

Table A 5: Characteristics of all Vulnerable Children by Background
Characteristics and Region (numbers)

Type of Vulnerability	Kampala	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Child Labourers	36,396	590,124	523,184	201,757	440,307	1,791,767
Orphaned Children	109,096	640,518	460,266	495,590	519,919	2,225,389
Children(6-17) not in school	75,299	232,491	228,297	361,347	311,415	1,208,849
Idle Children* (6-17)	40,166	76,443	145,559	232,902	138,182	633,253
Married Children(10-17)	1,613	5,030	15,340	11,684	12,015	45,681
Children living in child (0-17) headed households	9,484	673	1,982	5,420	17,560	9,484
Child (0-17) household heads	18,583	2,143	3,964	10,722	35,412	18,583
Children (0-17) living in older person headed households	83,936	669,490	496,557	306,591	575,508	2,132,081
Non-orphaned children (0-17) not living with their parents	143,582	799,267	619,536	379,465	437,351	2,379,200
Children (0-17) with a Disability	16,970	113,760	153,606	179,197	131,170	594,703
All Vulnerable Children (0-17)	308,499	2,327,780	2,676,145	2,559,908	2,195,034	10,067,367
Total Children (0-17)	728,474	3,685,952	4,040,889	3,189,578	3,946,829	15,591,722
Percent Vulnerable Children	42.3	63.2	66.2	80.3	55.6	64.6

* An idle child is one aged 6-17 years who is not engaged in any kind of work and is neither attending school

APPENDIX II (A)

SAMPLING DESIGN AND SAMPLE SIZE

The sample design of any household survey is guided by the main objectives to be studied. The objectives of the UNHS 2005/06 were to collect high quality and timely data on demographic, social and economic characteristics of the household population. In addition, the survey aimed at providing estimates of area and production of major crops and other characteristics at national and regional levels. The sample design used in this survey was different from earlier designs. Sample designs of previous household surveys treated each district as a separate stratum and further divisions were based on rural-urban categorization per district. In the current sample design however, districts were not taken as independent strata but were grouped and domains established as detailed below.

The Sample Design

A two stage sampling design was used to draw the sample. At the first stage Enumeration Areas (EAs) were drawn with Probability Proportional to Size (PPS), and at the second stage, households which are the Ultimate Sampling Units, were drawn with Simple Random Sampling (SRS).

Data from the Uganda Population Census conducted in 2002 was used as the Sampling Frame. The frame was thus divided into four regions: Central, Eastern, Northern and Western. The number and proportion of occupied housing units in each of the regions was computed, and thus each region in the sample was allocated a proportion equivalent to its weight in the population.

Table 1: Number and Proportion of Households, and Sample Allocation of the 600 EAs by Region

Region	Number of Households	Percentage of Households	Proportion Allocation of Households in Sample
Central	1,532,990	30.2	181
Eastern	1,243,068	24.5	147
Northern	1,010,727	19.9	119
Western	1,289,749	25.4	152
Uganda	5,076,534	100.0	600

The country was then divided into eight sampling regions: each of the regions was divided into a rural and urban region. Each of these eight regions was treated as a

stratum. This was to ensure that the sample size in each of these eight sub-regions was sufficient to produce estimates at the regional level. This was achieved by 'over-sampling' the urban areas in these regions by allocating 30 percent of the sample to the urban areas, and 70 percent to the rural areas. Because the survey was not intended to have district-level estimates, it was agreed that none of the districts needed to be treated as separate strata. This led to the sample allocation in Table 2.

Table 2: Allocation of 600 EAs by Region and Rural – Urban Breakdown

Region	Urban	Rural	Total
Central	54	127	181
Eastern	44	103	147
Northern	36	84	120
Western	46	106	152
Total	180	420	600

Sample Selection of EAs for the UNHS 2005/06

Due to the insecurity in the Northern region of the country, some sampled areas were inaccessible at the time of enumeration. As a result, a sample that is larger than the allocation in Table 2 in the Northern region was drawn. The EAs were held in reserve and a few were used to replace those that fell out of the sample. This was done by initially 'doubling' the number of EAs selected in the Northern region and then randomly dividing this sample into two equal halves. One half was assigned to the Main sample and the other half was retained in reserve, to be used as the replacement sample.

Table 3: Sample Allocation of the 720 EAs by Region, and Rural –Urban Breakdown

Region	Urban	Rural	Total
Central	54	127	181
Eastern	44	103	147
*Northern	72	168	240
Western	46	106	152
Total		504	720

**The Northern sample in Table 3 has twice the sample that is indicated in Table 2. This does not amount to a doubling of the Northern sample, but was done to facilitate the sample selection process, well knowing that the 36 EAs in the urban areas and 84 EAs in the rural areas will be visited.*

Drawing the Sample of EAs for the UNHS 2005/06

- The Census frame is a list of the lowest administrative units, 'Local Council 1', or LC. This is usually, but not always consistent with a village in rural area i.e. many LCs are EAs but some EAs comprise of more than one village. In addition, the sampling frame also indicates the EA where a particular LC belongs. The frame also has other administrative units including a rural-urban indicator, region, district, county, sub-county and parish. The first step was to combine these LCs into EAs so as to have a list of EAs. The 2002 Uganda Sampling Frame had a total of 48,715 LCs and 33,103 EAs.
- Thereafter all EAs in the sampling frame were divided into eight domains (urban/rural in each of four regions: Central, Eastern, Northern, Western) as outlined above. The allocation to each domain was done based on the proportion of households that each domain had in the Sampling Frame. Because such computations inevitably lead to results with decimals, such allocations were rounded off to the nearest whole number of households.
- The allocation in North Urban and North Rural was doubled to allow for EA attrition.
- Thereafter all the EAs in each domain were ordered (sorted) by district, county, sub-county and parish.
- The number of households (or occupied housing units) on the 2002 Census Frame was cumulated in each domains, and added to each EA in the domain. This cumulated measure of size is needed in order to generate the Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) selection. For each domain, a random number was generated (using the SAS *ranuni* function⁴⁹) and an appropriate 'seed' drawn from a random number Table as a four digit number to draw a sample in each domain or sub-region. The number of EAs in each domain was randomly selected with PPS using a random start and a sampling interval. Table 4 below presents the sampling interval, and random start provided to the SAS program.

⁴⁹ The SAS *ranuni* function generates random numbers and uses a 'seed' as an internal starting point. This seed may be zero, or another positive integer. Using zero as a seed means that each time a different sequence of random numbers is generated. On the other hand, using a non-zero seed ensures that the same sequence of random numbers is generated each time the program is run.

Table 4: Sampling Interval and Random start for each sub-stratum and the sampling interval

Domain	No. of households	No. of EAs Allocated	Sampling Interval*	Random seed used in the SAS <i>ranuni</i> function
Central - Urban	494,711	54	9161.3148	6944
Central - Rural	1,038,279	127	8175.4252	8842
Eastern - Urban	113,877	44	2588.1136	3848
Eastern - Rural	1,129,191	103	10963.0194	2116
Northern - Urban	92,456	2 X 36=72	1284.1111	5275
Northern - Rural	918,271	2 X 84=168	5465.8988	0738
Western - Urban	116,545	46	2533.5870	9618
Western - Rural	1,173,204	106	11067.9623	1272
Total	5,076,534	720		

*The Sampling Interval is the quotient of the number of Households divided by the number of Allocated EAs in each domain: e.g. in Central Urban, $9161.3148 = 494,711 \div 54$.

Separation of the Northern Sample into a Main and Replicate Sample

The Northern sample was then split into two equal halves: and one randomly allocated to the main sample and the other to the replicate sample. This was achieved by splitting the sample into equal sub-samples each of size 8 in each domain. Thus in North Urban we had 8 replicates each of size 9 EAs ($8 \times 9 = 72$), and in the North Rural domain we split the sample into 8 replicates each of size 21 ($8 \times 21 = 168$).

The assignment of each replicate to the main or reserve sample was achieved by randomly drawing numbers 1 to 8 from a random number Table. EAs in the first four numbers drawn less than or equal to eight to be drawn were assigned to the main sample. These were replicates 4, 5, 3 and 6 for North Urban and 1, 3, 6 and 7 for North Rural. This led to a sample of 36 EAs in North-Urban and 84 EAs in North-Rural, consistent with the sample allocation in Table 2. The remaining four replicates were assigned to the replicate sample and were added to the main sample in the order of being drawn randomly:

Table 5: Separation of the Northern Sample into Main and Replicate Sample

Domain	Main Sample Replicates		Replicate Sample Order		
Northern Urban	4, 5, 3 and 6	1	7	8	2
Northern Rural	1, 3, 6 and 7	4	5	8	2

Replacing EAs from the Replicate Sample in the Northern Region

Replicate samples were used to replace EAs that fell out as described above using the order presented in Table 5

Selection of Extra Sample in 10 Districts

The sample size in 10 districts of Apac, Arua, Bushenyi, Iganga, Kamuli, Masaka, Mbale, Mbarara, Mubende and Mukono was increased to generate district-level estimates. The sample in each of the districts was increased to 30 rural EAs (300 households) to meet this requirement. An inter-penetrating sampling scheme was used to select the extra EAs in each district. This was done by identifying the initial hit (or random start) that was used to select the district sample in the first sampling instance. Thereafter, another sample was drawn by using the same initial random start and by reducing the sampling interval by $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{3}$ in each of these districts. This was done on a district by district basis, and ensured that EAs already selected fell in the sample, as well as a set of completely new EAs. It is this set of new EAs that was used to increase the sample size in each district. The EAs that were already in the sample were ignored. Sometimes the set of new EAs was bigger than needed, and in this case a fractional sampling interval was used to sub-sample and attain the required number of EAs. This selection scheme led to an EPSEM sample.

After this selection process, each of the 10 districts had its rural sample increased to 30 EAs bringing the total number of EAs to 753 in the UNS III sample.

Table 7: Final Sample Allocation by District and Rural-Urban Breakdown

		Urban	Rural	Total		
		Main	Main	Over-Sample	Over-Sample	
Central	Kalangala		2		2	
	Kampala	34			34	
	Kayunga	1	6		7	
	Kiboga		5		5	
	Luweero	2	12		14	
	Masaka	3	18	12	21	12
	Mpigi		10		10	
	Mubende	2	17	13	19	13
	Mukono	3	19	11	22	11
	Nakasongola	1	3		4	
	Rakai	1	12		13	
	Ssembabule		5		5	
	Wakiso	7	18		25	
	Regional Total	54	127	36	181	36
Eastern	Bugiri	2	7		9	
	Busia	3	4		7	
	Iganga	6	11	19	17	19
	Jinja	11	5		16	
	Kaberamaido		2		2	
	Kamuli	2	12	18	14	18
	Kapchorwa		4		4	
	Katakwi	1	5		6	
	Kumi	1	7		8	
	Mayuge	1	3		4	
	Mbale	7	14	16	21	16
	Pallisa	2	8		10	
	Sironko	1	6		7	
	Soroti	3	6		9	
Tororo	4	9		13		
Regional Total	44	103	53	147	53	
Western	Bundibugyo	1	4		5	
	Bushenyi	3	12	18	15	18
	Hoima	3	6		9	
	Kabale	4	8		12	
	Kabarole	5	5		10	
	Kamwenge	1	5		6	
	Kanungu	2	3		5	
	Kasese	6	8		14	
	Kibaale	2	7		9	
	Kisoro	1	4		5	
	Kyenjojo	2	7		9	
	Masindi	4	7		11	
	Mbarara	9	18	12	27	12
	Ntungamo	2	7		9	
Rukungiri	1	5		6		
Regional Total	46	106	30	152	30	

Table 7: Final Sample Allocation by District and Rural-Urban Breakdown, contd.

Northern	Urban		Rural			Total		
	Main	Replicate	Main	Replicate	Over-Sample	Main	Replicate	Over-Sample
Adjumani	1	2	2	3		3	5	
Apac	2		14	12	16	16	12	16
Arua	5	4	12	13	18	17	17	18
Gulu	8	9	7	7		15	16	
Kitgum	3	3	5	4		8	7	
Kotido	1	3	6	8		7	11	
Lira	8	5	13	12		21	17	
Moroto		1	3	4		3	5	
Moyo		2	3	2		3	4	
Nakapiripirit	1		2	3		3	3	
Nebbi	5	5	7	7		12	12	
Pader	2		7	5		9	5	
Yumbe		2	3	4		3	6	
Regional Total	36	36	84	84	34	12	12	34

Sampling Plan for the UNHS 2005/06 in the Internally Displaced Camps (IDPs)

As of March 2005, there were 114 camps in four districts namely: Pader, Kitgum, Gulu and Lira. The total population resident in IDP camps at the time was estimated to be about 1.4 million people in 294,994 households. This translated into an average of 2,588 households per camp, with approximately 11,963 people in each camp and an average household size of 4.6. As expected there were wide variations between camps: for example the smallest camp had 313 households with a population of 1,343 persons; while the largest camp had a size of 11,682 households.

In the 2002 Frame we note that the four districts had a total of 325,692 rural households. This implied that about 90 percent of the households or population in these districts was resident in IDPs. Because the UNHS was nationally-representative there was need to include the population in IDPs in the UNHS sample to ensure that the sample was truly nationally representative. However, sampling households in districts that have IDP camps presented a particular challenge to the extent that it was difficult to link these households to particular EAs, and hence to assign accurate probabilities of selection to these households.

Because the majority of the rural population (90 percent in our estimate) in the four districts was in camps, a separate sample was drawn from the IDP population. To maintain the proportion of the IDP population the same in the population and the UNHS III sample, a sample of about 300 households in IDP camps was selected.

A three-stage sample selection was used to draw the IDP sample. At the first stage a sample of 30 Camps with PPS was drawn. At the second stage, a listing of all the Blocks in each camp was obtained and one Block drawn with PPS. At the third stage a random sample of 10 households was drawn from the selected Block with SRS. The Table below shows the IDP Camps covered during UNHS 2005/06.

APPENDIX II (B)

SAMPLE OF 30 INTERNALLY DISPLACED PEOPLE'S (IDP) CAMPS

Gulu District

County	Subcounty	Camp Name	No. of households
Aswa	Awach	Awach	3,388
Aswa	Paicho	Unyama	3,367
Kilak	Amuru	Amuru	9,217
Kilak	Atiak	Atiak	5,905
Kilak	Lamogi	Awer	3,687
Kilak	Lamogi	Parabongo	2,417
Kilak	Pabbo	Pabbo	11,682
Nwoya	Anaka	Anaka	6,751
Nwoya	Purongo	Purongo	2,036
Omoro	Lakwana	Opit	4,812
Omoro	Odek	Acet	4,745

Kitgum District

County	Subcounty	Camp Name	No. of households
Chua	Akwang	Akwang	3,177
Chua	Lagoro	Lagoro	2,690
Chua	Nam-kora	Nam-Okora	2,020
Lamwo	Agoro	Agoro	2,038
Lamwo	Madi-pei	Madi Opei	2,872
Lamwo	Palabek Kal	Palabek Kal	6,076

Lira District

County	Subcounty	Camp Name	No. of households
Dokolo	Batta	Batta	1,956
Erute	Barr	Barr	3,481
Erute	Ogur	Aler	1,864
Moroto	Aloi	Aleptong	2,368
Moroto	Amugu	Amugu	4,209
Moroto	Apala	Obim Rock	2,476

Pader District

County	Subcounty	Camp Name	No. of households
Agago	Adilang	Adilang	2,863
Agago	Lukole	Lukole	1,900
Agago	Patongo	Patongo	10,471
Agago	Puranga	Arum	1,526
Aruu	Acholibur	Acholibur	4,361
Aruu	Awere	Rackoko	2,200
Aruu	Pader TC	Pader TC	4,677

APPENDIX III

SAMPLING ERRORS

Household survey findings are usually estimates based on a sample of households selected using appropriate sample designs. Estimates are affected by two types of errors; sampling and non sampling errors.

Non Sampling errors result from wrong interpretation of results; mistakes in recording of responses, definitional problems, improper recording of data, etc and are mainly committed during the implementation of the survey.

Sampling errors, on the other hand, arise because observations are based on only one of the many samples that could have been selected from the same population using the same design and expected size. They are a measure of the variability between all possible samples. Sampling errors are usually measured using Standard Errors (SE). SE is the square root of the variance and can be used to calculate confidence intervals for the various estimates.

In addition, sometimes it is appropriate to measure the relative errors of some of the variables and the Coefficient of Variation (CV) is one such measure. It is the quotient of the SE divided by the mean of the variable of interest.

The SE and CVs were computed using STATA software. These take into account the multi-stage nature of the survey design in computing SE. The results below indicate the SE and CVs computed for the selected variables in the report. The SEs and CVs are presented for national regional and rural-urban levels

TOTAL HOUSEHOLD POPULATION

	Estimate	Standard Dev.	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	27,100,000	478,762	26,200,000	28,100,000	1.77	38,513
Urban	13,200,000	241,541	12,700,000	13,700,000	1.83	18,763
Rural	13,900,000	255,646	13,400,000	14,400,000	1.84	19,750
Central	22,900,000	547,306	21,900,000	24,000,000	2.39	30,506
Eastern	4,172,909	275,838	3,631,348	4,714,470	6.61	8,007
Northern						
Western	7,937,226	321,116	7,306,769	8,567,683	4.05	10,106

TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	5,224,107	82,133	5,062,852	5,385,362	1.57	7,417
Urban	4,312,025	96,329	4,122,900	4,501,151	2.23	5,718
Rural	912,082	57,048	800,078	1,024,085	6.25	1,699
Central	1,666,454	57,321	1,553,913	1,778,995	3.44	2,100
Eastern	1,208,009	29,797	1,149,508	1,266,511	2.47	1,923
Northern	1,033,006	25,148	983,632	1,082,381	2.43	1,624
Western	1,316,637	44,043	1,230,165	1,403,109	3.35	1,770

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	5.3	0.04	5.2	5.4	0.82	7,417
Urban	5.4	0.05	5.3	5.5	0.89	5,718
Rural	4.7	0.09	4.5	4.9	2.00	1,699
Central	4.9	0.09	4.7	5.0	1.78	2,100
Eastern	5.7	0.09	5.6	5.9	1.56	1,923
Northern	5.3	0.07	5.1	5.4	1.33	1,624
Western	5.4	0.09	5.3	5.6	1.63	1,770

LITERACY RATE (for Population Aged 18 years and above)

	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	69.4	0.55	68.3	70.4	0.79	25,662
Male	76.4	0.55	75.3	77.5	0.72	12,471
Female	62.7	0.69	61.3	64.0	1.10	13,191
Urban	65.9	0.61	64.7	67.1	0.92	19,779
Rural	85.9	0.89	84.1	87.6	1.04	5,883
Kampala	91.2	0.98	89.3	93.1	1.07	1,059
Central	79.7	0.93	81.5	81.5	1.17	5,836
Eastern	63.8	1.08	65.9	65.9	1.69	6,861
Northern	58.9	1.09	61.1	61.1	1.85	5,418
Western	67.1	1.14	69.3	69.3	1.70	6,488

PROPORTION THAT REPORTED FALLING SICK 30 DAYS PRECEDING THE SURVEY

	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	40.4	0.42	39.6	41.2	1.04	37,328
Male	38.1	0.53	37.1	39.1	1.38	18,224
Female	42.6	0.51	41.6	43.5	1.19	19,104
Urban	41.7	0.48	40.8	42.6	1.14	29,575
Rural	33.1	0.92	31.3	34.9	2.77	7,753
Kampala	26.4	1.29	23.8	28.9	4.91	1,348
Central	41.2	0.86	39.6	42.9	2.09	8,471
Eastern	48.8	0.79	47.2	50.4	1.63	10,196
Northern	41.2	0.75	39.7	42.6	1.81	8,346
Western	34.0	0.84	32.4	35.7	2.48	8,967

PROPORTION THAT SLEPT UNDER A MOSQUITO NET THE NIGHT BEFORE THE SURVEY

	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	16.8	0.62	15.6	18.0	3.67	37,048
Male	16.1	0.61	14.9	17.3	3.83	18,074
Female	17.6	0.68	16.2	18.9	3.86	18,974
Urban	13.1	0.59	12.0	14.3	4.51	29,371
Rural	37.1	2.06	33.1	41.2	5.54	7,677
Kampala	45.9	4.51	37.1	54.8	9.81	1,345
Central	15.8	1.36	13.2	18.5	8.58	8,419
Eastern	16.7	1.03	14.7	18.8	6.16	10,077
Northern	17.4	1.39	14.6	20.1	8.00	8,293
Western	10.9	0.84	9.3	12.6	7.68	8,914

PROPORTION REPORTING A PARTICULAR ILLNESS, UGANDA

	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Diarrhea	9.4	0.29	8.9	10.0	3.10	15,023
Malaria	60.9	0.61	59.8	62.1	1.00	15,023
Respiratory Infections	14.2	0.43	13.4	15.1	3.05	15,023
Skin Infections	3.2	0.18	2.8	3.5	5.62	15,023
Injury	2.7	0.15	2.4	2.9	5.49	15,023
Others	9.5	0.30	8.9	10.1	3.18	15,023

PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS HAVING A PARTICULAR CHARACTERISTIC, FOR SELECTED INDICATORS

	Indicator	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		CV (%)	No. of obs.
				Lower	Upper		
House Type	Detached	60.6	0.96	58.7	62.48039	1.58	7,416
	Tenement (Muzigo)	15.2	0.85	13.6	16.89722	5.57	7,416
	Hut	21.9	0.68	20.6	23.26296	3.10	7,416
Tenure	Owner Occupied	78.3	0.88	76.6	80.0	1.12	7,415
	Rented	15.3	0.84	13.6	16.9	5.47	7,415
	Free	15.3	0.84	13.6	16.9	5.47	7,415
Roof Type	Iron Sheets	60.6	0.93	58.8	62.5	1.53	7,416
	Thatched	38.1	0.91	36.3	39.9	2.39	7,416
Wall Type	Bricks	53.4	0.99	51.4	55.3	1.85	7,416
	Mud/Poles	42.0	0.94	40.2	43.9	2.24	7,416
Floor Type	Earth	73.5	0.97	71.6	75.4	1.32	7,416
	Cement	25.6	0.96	23.7	27.5	3.75	7,416
	Stones	0.3	0.07	0.2	0.4	21.64	7,416
Access to water	Safe water	67.6	1.04	65.5	69.6	1.54	7,415
	Un safe water	32.4	1.04	30.4	34.5	3.22	7,415
Toilets				0.0	0.0		
	Pit latrine	85.9	0.56	84.8	87.0	0.65	7,412
	VIP	2.5	0.24	2.0	3.0	9.57	7,412
	Flush toilet	1.1	0.27	0.6	1.7	24.12	7,412
Cooking Fuel	Bush/no toilet	10.4	0.45	9.5	11.3	4.35	
				0.0	0.0		
	Firewood	77.8	1.00	75.8	79.7	1.28	7,377
	Charcoal	18.2	0.88	16.5	20.0	4.85	7,377
	Paraffin	1.2	0.18	0.9	1.6	14.30	7,377
	Electricity	0.2	0.06	0.1	0.3	30.20	7,377

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY EXPENDITURE

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Coefficient of Variation	Number of observations
			Lower	Upper		
Uganda	206,900	4,500	198,066	215,735	2.17	7,416
Urban	173,496	3,766	166,103	180,889	2.17	5,717
Rural	364,807	18,114	329,244	400,370	4.97	1,699
Central	452,864	40,043	374,247	531,481	8.84	324
Eastern	249,052	11,387	226,695	271,409	4.57	1,776
Northern	175,987	6,053	164,103	187,872	3.44	1,922
Western	109,666	3,894	102,022	117,311	3.55	1,624

PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OWNERSHIP OF ASSETS

Indicator	Percentage	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		CV (%)	No. of obs.
			Lower	Upper		
House	80.4	0.80	78.8	81.9	0.99	7,406
Furniture	90.4	0.43	89.6	91.3	0.47	7,405
Electronic equipment	63.6	0.69	62.2	65.0	1.09	7,400
Bicycle	39.2	0.72	37.8	40.6	1.85	7,401
Motor cycle	2.6	0.21	2.1	3.0	8.33	7,334
Other transport equipment	1.4	0.20	1.0	1.8	14.05	7,350
Mobile phone	16.7	0.69	15.4	18.1	4.14	7,380

Section 3: General Information on Household Members

Ask only household members (usual and regular members).

P E R S O N I D	Is the natural father of living in this household? [NAME] ? 1= Yes 2= No but alive (>> 4) 3= No but Dead (>> 4) 4= No don't know (>> 4)	If living in house hold, Copy the ID Code of the father [>> 6]	What was/is the highest level of father's education completed? 1= No formal education 2= Less than primary 3= Completed primary 4= Completed O-level 5= Completed A-level 6= Completed university 7= Don't know 8= Other (specify)	What was/is his usual occupation? See code sheet	Is the natural mother of living in this househ old? [NAME] ? 1= Yes 2= No but alive (>> 4) 3= No but Dead (>> 4) 4= No don't know (>> 4)	If living in househ old, Copy the ID Code of the mother [>> 9]	What was/is the highest level of mother's education completed? 1= No formal education 2= Less than primary 3= Completed primary 4= Completed O-level 5= Completed A-level 6= Completed university 7= Don't know 8= Other (specify)	For all household members aged 10 years and above							
								Since 2001, has [NAME] lived in another place, such as another village, another town or country, for 6 or more months at one time? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 15)	When did [NAME] move here [CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE] the most recent time? Year	In what district or country did [NAME] live before coming to [CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE] the most recent time? DISTRICT CODE	Was the place where [NAME] lived before coming here a rural or urban area? 1= Rural 2= Urban	What was the main reason you came to [CURRENT PLACE OF RESIDENCE] the most recent time?	In how many other places (such as another village, town or abroad) did [NAME] live for 6 or more months at one time since 2001?	Do you currently use or have you used any tobacco products such as cigarettes, cigars, pipes or chewable tobacco? 1= Yes 2= No (>> NEXT PERSON)	For how long (in years) have you been using them or did you use them? Completed years
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

Code for 13
 1= To look for work
 2= Other income reasons
 3= Drought
 4= Eviction
 5= Other land related problems
 6= Illness, injury
 7= Disability

8=Education
 9= Marriage
 10= Divorce
 11= To escape insecurity
 12= To return home from displacement
 13= Abduction
 14= Follow/join family
 15= Other (specify)

Section 4: Education: All Persons 5 Years and above

Ask the following questions about all members of the household (usual and regular) who are 5 years and above.

PERSON	Have you ever attended any formal school? 1= Never attended 2= Attended school in the past (>> 4) 3= Currently attending school (>> 6)	Why have you not attended school? See code below [>> NEXT PERSON]	What was the highest grade that you completed? See code sheet	Why did you leave school? See code below [>> NEXT PERSON]	What grade are you currently attending? See code sheet	Who manages the school? 1= Government 2= Private 3= NGO/religious organization 4= Other (specify)	What type of school are you currently attending? 1= Day 2= Boarding 3= Day and Boarding	Distance to the school in km? ONLY FOR DAY SCHOLARS	How much has your household spent during the past 12 months on your schooling? IF NOTHING WAS SPENT, WRITE 0. IF THE RESPONDENT CAN ONLY GIVE A TOTAL AMOUNT, WRITE (DK) IN THE RELEVANT COLUMNS AND THE TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 10f.						Are you currently receiving a scholarship or subsidy given by the government or school to support your education? 1= Yes 2= No	For those with codes 10 – 17 in column 4 and aged 10 years and above Can you read and write with understanding in any language? See codes below
									School and registration fees (contribution to school development fund)	Uniforms and sport clothes	Books and school supplies	Boarding fees	Other expenses	Total expenses		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10a	10b	10c	10d	10e	10f	11	12

Code for 3

- 1= Too expensive
- 2= Too far away
- 3= Poor school quality
- 4= Had to help at home
- 5= Had to help with farm work

- 6= Had to help with family business
- 7= Education not useful
- 8= Parents did not want
- 9= Not willing to attend
- 10= Too young
- 11= Orphaned

- 12= Displaced
- 13= Disabled
- 14= Insecurity
- 15= Other (specify)

Code for 5

- 1= Completed desired schooling
- 2= Further schooling not available
- 3= Too expensive
- 4= Too far away
- 5= Had to help at home
- 6= Had to help with farm work
- 7= Had to help with family business
- 8= Poor school quality

- 9= Parents did not want
- 10= Not willing to attend further
- 11= Poor academic progress
- 12= Sickness or calamity in family
- 13= Pregnancy
- 14= Other (specify)

Code for column 12

- 1= Unable to read and write
- 2= Able to read only
- 3= Able to read and write
- 4= Uses Braille

Section 5: Health: All Household Members (SELF-REPORT AGE 15 AND OLDER, MOTHER/GUARDIAN ANSWERS FOR CHILDREN LESS THAN AGE 15)

Ask the following questions about all members of the household (usual and regular).

PERSON	During the past 30 days, did you suffer from any illness or injury? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 12)	For how many days did you suffer due to illness or injury during the past 30 days? Days	For how many days did you have to stop doing your usual activities due to illness or injury during the past 30 days? Days	Can you describe the symptoms that you primarily suffered from the major illness or injury during the past 30 days? Record upto 3 symptom codes See code below			Was anyone consulted (e.g. a doctor, nurse, pharmacist or traditional healer) for the major illness or injury during the past 30 days? 1= Yes (>> 8) 2= No	Why was no one consulted for the major illness? See code below [> 12]	Where did you go for the first consultation during the past 30 days? 1= Drugs at Home (>> 12) 2= Neighbor/Friend 3= Community health worker 4= HOMAPAK drug distributor 5= Ordinary shop 6= Drug shop/Pharmacy 7= Private clinic 8= Health unit government 9= Health unit NGO 10= Hospital government 11= Hospital NGO 12= Traditional healer 13= Other (specify)	Distance to the place where this treatment was sought for in km?	What was the cost of this consultation, including any medicine prescribed even if purchased elsewhere?	What was the cost of transportation to the place where this treatment was sought including hotel expenses?	During the past 6 months (including the past 30 days), did you suffer from any illness or injury? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 14)	For how many days in total did you have to stop doing your usual activity due to illness during the past 6 months (including the past 30 days)? Days	For how many days did you have to stop doing your usual activities caring for other member of the household who were sick during the past 6 months? Days	
				5a	5b	5c										6

Code for 5

- 1= Diarrhoea (acute)
- 2= Diarrhoea (chronic, 1 month or more)
- 3= Weight loss (major)
- 4= Fever (acute)
- 5= Fever (recurring)
- 6= Malaria
- 7= Skin rash
- 7= Weakness
- 9= Severe headache
- 10= Fainting

- 11= Chills (feeling hot and cold)
- 12= Vomiting
- 13= Cough
- 14= Coughing blood
- 15= Pain on passing urine
- 16= Genital sores
- 17= Mental disorder
- 20= Abdominal pain
- 21= Sore throat
- 22= Difficulty breathing
- 23= Burn

- 24= Fracture
- 25= Wound
- 26= Child birth related
- 27= Other (specify)

Code for 7

- 1= Illness mild
- 2= Facility too far
- 3= Hard to get to facility
- 4= Too dangerous to go
- 5= Available facilities are costly

- 6= No qualified staff present
- 7= Staff attitude not good
- 8= Too busy / long waiting time
- 9= Facility is inaccessible
- 10= Facility is closed
- 11= Facility is destroyed
- 12= Drugs not available
- 13= Other (specify)

Section 6: Malaria, Fever and Disability Module

Ask the following questions about all members of the household (usual and regular) unless specified.

PERSON ID	Second Visit		Do you have (serious) difficulty in moving, seeing, hearing, speaking or learning which has lasted or expected to last 6 months or more? 1= Yes, all the time 2= Yes, sometimes 3= No (>> 10)	Difficulty		Condition		Cause		Rehabilitation		Are you able to work or to attend school?		Did [NAME] sleep under a mosquito net last night? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 12)	Was this net ever soaked or dipped in a liquid to repel mosquitoes or bugs during the past 12 months? 1= Yes 2= No 3= Not sure	For females aged 15 – 54 years old			
	For how many days in total did you have to stop doing your usual activity due to illness during the past 6 months? Days	For how many days did you stop doing your usual activities caring for other member of the household who were sick during the past 6 months? Days		What are the type of difficulties you face? Up to two most serious difficulties 1= Seeing 2= Hearing 3= Communication 4= Taking part in social activities 5= Learning 6= Mobility problems 7= Personal care 8= Psychological, emotional 9= Other (specify)	Which condition best describes the difficulty you have? Keep the order as in 5. See code below	What caused these Difficulties? Keep the order as in 5. 1= Congenital (born with a disability) 2=Disease/illness/infection 3= Intentional injury 4=Unintentional injury 5= Abduction 6= Sexual abuse 7= Witchcraft 8= Natural aging process 9= Psychological trauma 10= Other (specify)	During the past 12 months, what measures are taken to improve your performance of activities? Keep the order as in 5. See code below		1= Yes, all the time 2= Yes, sometimes 3= No 4= NA		Working	Schooling	Has [NAME] ever been pregnant during the last 5 years? 1=Yes: 2=No (>> NEXT PERSON)			When you were pregnant with [LAST BIRTH] did you take any drugs in order to prevent malaria? 1=Yes 2=No (>> NEXT PERSON)	Which drug did you take? 1 = SP/Fansidar 2 = Chloroquine (>> NEXT PERSON) 3= Camaquine (>> NEXT PERSON) 4= Quinine (>> NEXT PERSON) 5 = Other (specify) (>> NEXT PERSON) 6= Do not know (>> NEXT PERSON)	How many times/doses did you take Fansidar during this pregnancy?	
							1st	2nd	1st	2nd									1st
1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b	10	11	12	13	14	15

Code for 6a and 6b

- 1= Limited use of legs, feet
- 2= No leg(s), feet
- 3= Limited use of arms(s), hand(s)
- 4= No arm(s), hand(s)
- 5= Facial mutilation (nose, lips, ears)
- 6= Serious problem with back spine
- 7= Hearing difficulty

- 8= Deafness
- 9= Serious speech impediment
- 10= Unable to speak
- 11= Poor vision
- 12= Blindness
- 13= Mental retardation
- 14= Mental illness
- 15= Frequent Nightmares
- 16= Mood changes

- 17= Feeling of helplessness
- 18= Epilepsy, fits
- 19= Chronic joint disease
- 20= Loss of feeling e.g. leprosy
- 21= Spinal lesion
- 22= Other (specify)

Code for 8a and 8b

- 1= None
- 2= Surgical operation

- 3= Medication
- 4= Assistive devices (glasses, wheelchair, braces, hearing aid, artificial limbs)
- 5= Special education
- 6= Skills training (vocational)
- 7= Activity of Daily Living (ADL) training
- 8= Counseling
- 9= Spiritual/traditional healer
- 10= Other (specify)

Section 7A: Activities of Household Members

For all household members 5 years and above (usual and regular)

P E R S O N I D	During the past 7 days, have you worked for pay for an enterprise or someone who is not a member of your household at least for one hour in any day? 1= Yes 2= No	During the past 7 days, have you worked on a land owned or occupied by a member of your household either in cultivating crops or in farming tasks , or have you cared for livestock belonging to a member of your household or fishing at least for one hour in any day? 1= Yes 2= No	During the last 7 days, have you worked on your own account or in a business enterprise belonging to you or someone in your household, for example, trader, shopkeeper, barber, etc. at least for one hour in any day? 1= Yes 2= No	AMONG THE ANSWERS TO 2, 3 AND 4 IS THERE A "YES" (CODE 1)? 1= Yes (>> 10) 2= No	Even if you did not work in the last 7 days for some reason, did you have a permanent job or enterprise such as a retail shop, a factory, farm or service establishment? 1= Yes (>> col (2) of sec. 7B) 2= No	Have you looked for and/or available for work in the last 7 days? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 9)	How long have you been looking for and/or available for work? Duration in months [>> col (6) of sec. 7B]	What is the main reason you did not look for a job in the past 7 days? (MOST IMPORTANT REASON) 1= Student 2= Household duties 3= Too young 4= Too old/ retired 4= Handicapped 6= Waiting for a reply from employer 7= Waiting for a recall from employer 8= Waiting for busy season 9= Other [>> col (6) of sec. 7B]	During the last 7 days, how many hours did you work on each day? Codes for days (column 10-16) 1=Monday 2=Tuesday 3=Wednesday 4=Thursday 5=Friday 6=Saturday 7=Sunday INTERVIEWER: Actual number of hours worked starting from the previous day and going back-wards on main and all secondary activities.							Have you looked for an alternative work and/or have you been available for additional work in the last 7 days? 1= Yes 2= No
									Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day7	
									10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17

Section 7B: Activities of Household Members (Continued)

P E R S O N I D	What was your main employment status during the last 7 days? Self-Employed persons 1=Employer 2=Own account worker 3=Unpaid family worker Paid Employee 4=Gov't Permanent 5=Gov't Temporary/casual 6=Private Permanent 7=Private Temporary/ casual	What was the nature of work (for the main employment status) that you did during the last 7 days? (OCCUPATION)		What was the main economic activity of your place of work? (INDUSTRY)		In addition to the main occupation, did you also work in any subsidiary occupation during the last 7 days? 1= Yes 2= No	During the past 7 days, how many hours did you spend fetching water for the household including travel time? If none, write 0 Hours	During the past 7 days, how many hours did you spend fetching fire wood for the household including travel time? If none, write 0 Hours	During the past 7 days, how many hours did you spend in cooking for the household? If none, write 0 Hours	During the past 7 days, how many hours did you spend in taking care of children and the elderly? If none, write 0 Hours	What were your main and secondary employment statuses during the past 12 months? 1=Employer 2=Own account worker 3=Unpaid family worker 4=Gov't Permanent 5=Gov't Temporary /casual 6=Private Permanent 7=Private Temporary/ casual 8= Fulltime student 9= Pensioner/retired 10= Children not at school 11= Other (specify)		During the past 12 months (including the last 7 days), did you work for a salary or wage? 1= Yes 2= No
		Describe in not less than 2 words	Code	Describe in not less than 2 words	Code						Main	Secondary	
1	2	3a	3b	4a	4b	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Section 8: Wage Employment

We would like to ask you about your work during the past 12 months for which you received wage or any other payment. **INTERVIEWERS:** This section should be completed for all individuals who have worked for a salary or wage during the past 12 months (check column 12 of section 7B). **Include all the wage employment activities.** Use extra sheet if necessary.

P E R S O N I D	What kind of job?		What kind of industry is it connected with?		What was the employment status?	How many months did you work as [...] in the past 12 months?	During these months, how many days did you usually work per month?	During these days, how many hours did you usually work per day?	How much was your last cash payment and the estimated value of what you last received in-kind for this work? What period of time did this payment cover?		How many hours did you work for the pay you just reported? Please include any hours of paid vacation or sick leave?	
	Description	Occupation code	Description	Industry code	1=Gov't Permanent 2=Gov't Temporary/casual 3=Private Permanent 4=Private Temporary/casual				Amount			Time Unit
									Cash	Estimated cash value of in-kind payments		
1	2a	2b	3a	3b	4	5	6	7	8a	8b	8c	9

- Code for column 8c**
 1= Hour
 2= Day
 3= Week
 4= Fortnight
 5= Month
 6= Quarter
 7= Half year
 8=Year

Section 9: Non-Agricultural Household Enterprises/Activities

1. Over the past 12 months, has anyone in your household operated any non-agricultural enterprise which produces goods or services (for example, artisan, metalworking, tailoring, repair work; also include processing and selling your outputs from your own crops if done regularly) or has anyone in your household owned a shop or operated a trading business or profession?

1= Yes

2= No (>> NEXT SECTION)

E N T R P R I S E I D	Description of enterprise	Industry code See code sheet	ID Code of person responsible	Year started (yyyy)	What was the main source of money for setting up the business? See code below	Have you received a credit to operate or expand your business during the past 12 months? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 9)	What was the major source? See code below	Which people in the household work in this enterprise/ activity? WRITE ID CODES FROM ROSTER					In the past 12 months, how many months did the enterprise operate?	What is/was the average monthly gross revenues during the months when the enterprise is/was operating?	How many people does your enterprise normally hire (during a month when the enterprise is/was operating? If none, write '0' and go to 14	What is/was the average expenditure on wages during that month?	What is/was the average expenditure on raw materials during that month?	Other operating expenses such as fuel, kerosene, electricity etc. during that month?
								A	B	C	D	E						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9a	9b	9c	9d	9e	10	11	12	13	14	15

Code for 7

- 1= Didn't need any money
2= Own savings
3= Commercial/ Development bank
4= Microfinance institutions
5= Local group
6= NGO
7= Other (specify)

Code for 9

- 1= Formal Banks (commercial/development)

2= Micro finance institutions

- 3= NGO
4= Credit union
5= Landlord
6= Employer
7= Local group
8= Relative
9= Friend
10= Local money lender
11= Other (specify)

Section 10: Transfer and Other Incomes to the Household

Has the household received any other income (such as remittances, gifts or other transfers) **in the past 12 months?**

Type of income	Income code	Has the household received any [...] in the past 12 months? 1= Yes 2= No (>> NEXT CATEGORY)	Amount received during the past 12 months. If amount was in kind, give the estimated cash value.		What were the reasons why the person(s) sent the remittances and assistances for? Up to two in order of their importance. See code below	
			Cash (U.shs.)	In-kind (Estimated cash value) (U.shs.)	1st	2nd
1	2	3	4	5	6a	6b
Pension and life insurance annuity benefits	31					
Remittances and assistance received locally (elsewhere in the country)	32					
Remittances and assistance received from abroad	33					
Income from the sale of assets excluding livestock	34					
Other income (inheritance, alimony, scholarship, other unspecified income, etc.)	35					

Code for 6a and 6b

- 1= Buy land
- 2= Buy livestock
- 3= Buy farm tools and implements
- 4= Buy farm inputs such as seeds, fertilizer, pesticides
- 5= Purchase inputs/working capital for non-farm enterprises
- 6= Pay for building materials (To buy house)
- 7= Buy consumption goods and services
- 8= Pay for education expenses
- 9= Pay for health expenses
- 10= Pay for ceremonial expenses
- 11= Other (specify)

Section 11: Housing Conditions

Now we would like to ask you about your housing conditions: all the rooms and all separate building used by your household members.

1. What type of dwelling is it?
- 1= Independent house
2= Tenement (Muzigo)
3= Independent flat/apartment
4= Sharing house/flat/apartment
5= Boys quarters
6= Garage
7= Hut
8= Uniport
9= Other (specify)
- Now
- 2001
2. What is its tenure status?
- 1= Owned
2= Rented (Normal)
3= Rented (subsidized)
4= Supplied free by employer
5= Supplied free or rent paid by relative or other person
6= Other (specify)
- Now
- 2001
3. How many rooms does your household occupy?
- | | Now | 2001 |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Total | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Kitchen | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Toilet/Bathroom | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Bedrooms | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Living/Dining rooms | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Mixed use | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Other | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
4. What is the major construction material of the roof?
- 1= Thatch, Straw
2= Mud
3= Wood, Planks
4= Iron sheets
5= Asbestos
6= Tiles
7= Tin
8= Cement
9= Other
- Now
- 2001

5. What is the major construction material of the external wall?

- 1= Thatch, Straw
- 2= Mud and poles Now
- 3= Timber
- 4= Un-burnt bricks
- 5= Burnt bricks with mud
- 6= Burnt bricks with cement 2001
- 7= Cement blocks
- 8= Stone
- 9= Other

6. What is the major material of the floor?

- 1= Earth
- 2= Earth and cow dung Now
- 3= Cement
- 4= Mosaic or tiles
- 5= Bricks
- 6= Stone
- 7= Wood 2001
- 8= Other

7. What is the main source of water for drinking for your household?

- 1= Private connection to pipeline
- 2= Public taps
- 3= Bore-hole Now
- 4= Protected well/spring
- 5= Unprotected well/spring
- 6= River, stream, lake, pond
- 7= Vendor/Tanker truck 2001
- 8= Gravity flow scheme
- 9= Rain water
- 10= Other (specify)

8. How long does it take to collect the drinking water from the main source? (**Time in minutes** if the answer in question 7 is different from 1, 7, 8, and 9 in the relevant box)

Now	To and from	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>	Waiting time	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>
------------	-------------	---	--------------	---

2001	To and from	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>	Waiting time	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>
-------------	-------------	---	--------------	---

9. How far is the main source from your dwelling? (**Distance in kilo meters**)

	Now	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>
--	-----	---

	2001	<input style="width: 100%; height: 100%;" type="text"/>
--	------	---

10. What is the type of toilet that is mainly **used** in your household?
- 1= Covered pit latrine private
2= Covered pit latrine shared Now
3= VIP latrine private
4= VIP latrine shared
5= Uncovered pit latrine
6= Flush toilet private 2001
7= Flush toilet shared
8= Bush
9= Other
11. What is the main source of lighting in your dwelling?
- 1= Electricity
2= Paraffin, kerosene or gas lantern Now
3= Tadooba
4= Firewood
5= Solar
6= Biogas 2001
7= Other (specify)
12. What type of fuel do you use most often for cooking?
- 1= Firewood Now
2= Charcoal
3= Paraffin/kerosene
4= Electricity
5= Gas
6= Solar 2001
7= Biogas
8= Saw dust
9= Other (specify)
13. What type of cooking technology do you use in your household?
- 1= Traditional metal stove (Sigiri)
2= Traditional 3-stone stove Now
3= Improved charcoal stove
4= Improved firewood stove
5= Gas stove
6= Paraffin stove
7= Saw-dust stove 2001
8= Electric plate
9= Other

Section 12: Household and Enterprise Assets

Type of assets	Asset code	Does any member of your household own [ASSET] at present? 1=Yes 2=No (>> 6)	How many [...] do your household own at present?		Did any member of your household own [ASSET] 12 months ago? 1=Yes 2=No (>> 9)	How many [...] did your household own 12 months ago?		Compared with 2001, would you say that your [...] is 1= Much more now 2= More now 3= About equal 4= Less now 5= Much less now
			Number	Total estimated value (in Shs)		Number	Total estimated value (in Shs.)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Household Assets								
House	001							
Other Buildings	002							
Furniture	003							
Furnishings e.g. carpet, mat, mattress, etc..	004							
Bed nets	005							
Household Appliances e.g. Kettle, Flat iron, etc.	006							
Electronic Equipment e.g. TV., Radio, Cassette, etc.	007							
Generators	008							
Solar panel/electric inverters	009							
Bicycle	010							
Motor cycle	011							
Other Transport equipment	012							
Jewelry and Watches	013							
Mobile phone	014							
Other household assets e.g. lawn mowers, etc.	015							
Enterprise (Agricultural and Non-Agricultural) Assets								
Hoe	101							
Ploughs	102							
Pangas, slashers, etc.	103							
Wheelbarrows	104							
Other agricultural equipment	105							
Transport equipment for enterprise	106							
Other enterprise equipment	107							

Financial Assets

Type of financial Institution	Code	Does any member of your household have a saving account? 1= Yes 2= No (>> NEXT SECTION)	What is the current value of the [ITEM] that the household owns?	And 12 months ago?	How much has the household received from [ITEM] in the form of interest in the past 12 months?
1	2	3	4	5	6

Savings account with formal institutions	201			
--	-----	--	--	--

Section 13: Outstanding Loans in the Last 12 Months

Part A: Borrowing capacity

Name of the borrowing source	Code	Can the head or his/her spouse borrow money from [SOURCE] now? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 5a)		If 3a or 3b = 1 What is the maximum amount the head or his/her spouse can borrow? (U.Shs.)		Could the head or his/her spouse borrow money from [SOURCE] in 2001? 1= Yes 2= No (>> NEXT SOURCE)		If 5a or 5b = 1 What was the maximum amount the head or his/her spouse could borrow at that time? (U.Shs.)	
		Head	Spouse	Head If 3a = 1	Spouse If 3b = 1	Head	Spouse	Head If 5a = 1	Spouse If 5b = 1
1	2	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b
Friends/relatives	101								
Private money lender	102								
Landlord	103								
Employer	104								
Bank	105								
Microfinance institutions	106								
Input trader/shop keeper	107								
Others (specify)	108								

Part B: Demand for Credit

Source of Credit	Code	Have you or any other member of your household ever applied for loan to [...] during the last 12 months? 1= Yes (>> NEXT SOURCE) 2= No	Why you or any other member of your household did not apply to this source? 1= No need 2= Do not know where to apply 3= No supply available locally 4= Inadequate security 5= Interest too high 6= Do not like to be indebted 7= Believed would be refused 8= Lack of sensitization 9= Other (specify)
1	2	3	4
Formal financial institutions (bank and other government agency subject to central monetary authority regulation)	201		
"Semiformal institutions" such as microfinance institutions, cooperatives, non- governmental organizations, etc.	202		

Informal source such as friends and relatives, local money lenders, shop keepers, landlord/employer, village level associations (rotating savings), etc.	203		
--	-----	--	--

Part C: Loan Details

If any 'YES' in column (3) of Part B (either to formal institutions, semiformal institutions or informal sources) above please fill the relevant items for each loan applied during the last 12 months.

L O A N N O	ID code of person who applied for loan	When did [NAME] apply?		What was the main reason for applying? See code below	What was the source? See code below	How much did [NAME] ask for?	What is the status of the loan application? 1= Fully or partly approved 2= Rejected (>> NEXT LOAN) 3= Still pending (>> NEXT LOAN)	How much did [NAME] receive?	How much was paid back to lender (principal plus interest)? If none, write '0'	How much is still outstanding – has to be paid back to lender – (principal plus interest)? If none, write '0'	Repayment period Months If no fixed term, write '99'	What was required as security? See code below
		Year	Month									
1	2	3a	3b	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												

Code for 4

- 1= Buy land
- 2= Buy livestock
- 3= Buy farm tools and implements
- 4= Buy farm inputs such as seeds, fertilizer, pesticides
- 5= Purchase inputs/working capital for non-farm enterprises
- 6= Pay for building materials (To buy house)
- 7= Buy consumption goods and services

- 8= Pay for education expenses
- 9= Pay for health expenses
- 10= Pay for ceremonial expenses
- 11= Other (specify)

Code for 5

- 1= Formal Banks (commercial/development)
- 2= Micro finance institutions
- 3= NGO
- 4= Cooperatives

- 5= Landlord
- 6= Employer
- 7= Local group
- 8= Relative
- 9= Friend
- 10= Local money lender
- 11= Other (specify)

Code for 12

- 1= None
- 2= Land
- 3= Livestock
- 4= House
- 5= Future harvests
- 6= Vehicle
- 7= Group (peer monitoring)
- 8= Character
- 9= Other (Specify)

Section 14A: Household Consumption Expenditure

On average, how many people were present in the last 7 days? In this section children are defined as less than 18 years.

Household Members				Visitors			
Male adults	Female adults	Male children	Female children	Male adults	Female adults	Male children	Female children

(Part A) Food, Beverage, and Tobacco (During the Last 7 Days)

Item Description	Code	Unit of Quantity	Consumption out of Purchases				Consumption out of home produce		Received in-kind/Free		Market Price	Farm gate price
			Household		Away from home		Qty	Value	Qty	Value		
			Qty	Value	Qty	Value						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Matoke	101											
Matoke	102											
Matoke	103											
Matoke	104											
Sweet Potatoes (Fresh)	105											
Sweet Potatoes (Dry)	106											
Cassava (Fresh)	107											
Cassava (Dry/ Flour)	108											
Irish Potatoes	109											
Rice	110											
Maize (grains)	111											
Maize (cobs)	112											
Maize (flour)	113											
Bread	114											
Millet	115											
Sorghum	116											
Beef	117											
Pork	118											
Goat Meat	119											
Other Meat	120											
Chicken	121											
Fresh Fish	122											
Dry/ Smoked fish	123											
Eggs	124											
Fresh Milk	125											
Infant Formula Foods	126											
Cooking oil	127											
Ghee	128											
Margarine, Butter, etc	129											

Section 14A: ... Continued

(Part A) Food, Beverage, and Tobacco (During the Last 7 Days)

Item Description	Code	Unit of Quantity	Consumption out of Purchases				Consumption out of home produce		Received in-kind/Free		Market Price	Farm gate price
			Household		Away from home		Qty	Value	Qty	Value		
			Qty	Value	Qty	Value						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Passion Fruits	130											
Sweet Bananas	131											
Mangos	132											
Oranges	133											
Other Fruits	134											
Onions	135											
Tomatoes	136											
Cabbages	137											
Dodo	138											
Other vegetables	139											
Beans fresh)	140											
Beans (dry)	141											
Ground nuts (in shell)	142											
Ground nuts (shelled)	143											
Ground nuts (pounded)	144											
Peas	145											
Sim sim	146											
Sugar	147											
Coffee	148											
Tea	149											
Salt	150											
Soda*	151											
Beer*	152											
Other Alcoholic drinks	153											
Other drinks	154											
Cigarettes	155											
Other Tobacco	156											
Expenditure in Restaurants on:												
1. Food	157											
2. Soda	158											
3. Beer	159											
Other juice	160											
Other foods	161											

* Sodas and Beers to be recorded here are those that are not taken with food in restaurants.

Section 14B: Household Consumption Expenditure

(Part B) Non-Durable Goods and Frequently Purchased Services (During the last 30 days)

Item Description	Code	Unit of Quantity	Purchases		Home produced		Received in-kind/Free		Unit Price
			Qty	Value	Qty	Value	Qty	Value	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rent of rented house/Fuel/power									
Rent of rented house	301								
Imputed rent of owned house	302								
Imputed rent of free house	303								
Maintenance and repair expenses	304								
Water	305								
Electricity	306								
Generators/lawn mower fuels	307								
Paraffin (Kerosene)	308								
Charcoal	309								
Firewood	310								
Others	311								
Non-durable and Personal Goods									
Matches	451								
Washing soap	452								
Bathing soap	453								
Tooth paste	454								
Cosmetics	455								
Handbags, travel bags etc	456								
Batteries (Dry cells)	457								
Newspapers and Magazines	458								
Others	459								
Transport and communication									
Tires, tubes, spares, etc	461								
Petrol, diesel etc	462								
Taxi fares	463								
Bus fares	464								
Boda boda fares	465								
Stamps, envelops, etc.	466								
Air time & services fee for owned fixed/ mobile phones	467								
Expenditure on phones not owned	468								
Others	469								

Section 14B: ... Continued

(Part B) Non-Durable Goods and Frequently Purchased Services (During the last 30 days)

Item Description	Code	Unit of Quantity	Purchases		Home produced		Received in-kind/Free		Unit Price
			Qty	Value	Qty	Value	Qty	Value	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Health and Medical Care									
Consultation Fees	501								
Medicines etc	502								
Hospital/ clinic charges	503								
Traditional Doctors fees/ medicines	504								
Others	509								
Other services									
Sports, theaters, etc	701								
Dry Cleaning and Laundry	702								
Houseboys/ girls, Shamba boys etc	703								
Barber and Beauty Shops	704								
Expenses in hotels, lodging, etc	705								

Section 14C: Household Consumption Expenditure

(Part C) Semi-Durable Goods and Durable Goods and Service (During the last 365 days)

Item Description	Code	Purchases	Consumption out of household /enterprise stock	Received in-kind/Free
		Value	Value	Value
1	2	3	4	5
Clothing and Footwear				
Men's clothing	201			
Women's clothing	202			
Children's clothing (excluding school uniforms)	203			
Other clothing and clothing materials	209			
Tailoring and Materials	210			
Men's Footwear	221			
Women's Footwear	222			
Children's Footwear	223			
Other Footwear and repairs	229			
Furniture, Carpet, Furnishing etc				
Furniture Items	401			
Carpets, mats, etc	402			
Curtains, Bed sheets, etc	403			
Bedding Mattresses	404			
Blankets	405			
Others and Repairs	409			
Household Appliances and Equipment				
Electric iron/ Kettles etc	421			
Charcoal and Kerosene Stoves	422			
Electronic Equipment (TV, radio cassette etc)	423			
Bicycles	424			
Radio	425			
Motors, Pick-ups, etc	426			
Motor cycles	427			
Computers for household use	428			
Phone Handsets (both fixed and mobile)	429			
Other equipment and repairs	430			
Jewelry, Watches, etc	431			

Section 14C: ... Continued

(Part C) Semi-Durable Goods and Durable Goods and Service (During the last 365 days)

Item Description	Code	Purchases	Consumption out of household enterprise stock	Received in-kind/Free
		Value	Value	Value
1	2	3	4	5
Glass/ Table ware, Utensils, etc				
Plastic basins	441			
Plastic plates/ tumblers	442			
Jerrycans and plastic buckets	443			
Enamel and metallic utensils	444			
Switches, plugs, cables, etc	445			
Others and repairs	449			
Education				
School fees including PTA	601			
Boarding and Lodging	602			
School uniform	603			
Books and supplies	604			
Other educational expenses	609			
Services Not elsewhere Specified				
Expenditure on household functions	801			
Insurance Premiums	802			
Other services N.E.S.	809			

Section 14D: Non-consumption Expenditure

Item description	Code	Value during the last 12 months
1	2	3
Income tax	901	
Property rates (taxes)	902	
User fees and charges	903	
Graduated tax	904	
Pension and social security payments	905	
Remittances, gifts, and other transfers	906	
Funerals and other social functions	907	
Others (like subscriptions, interest to consumer debts, etc.)	909	

Section 15: Welfare Indicators

Reference period	Code	What is the household's most important source of earnings during last 12 months? 1= Subsistence farming 2= Commercial farming 3= Wage employment 4= Non-agricultural enterprises 5= Property income 6= Transfers (pension, allowances, social security benefits, remittances) 7= Organizational support (e.g. food aid, WFP, NGOs etc) 8= Other (specify)	Does every member of the household have at least two sets of clothes? 1= Yes 2= No	Does every child in this household (all those under 18 years old) have a blanket? 1= Yes 2= No	Does every member of the household have at least one pair of shoes? 1= Yes 2= No	What is the average number of meals taken by household members per day in the last 7 days?	What did you do when you last ran out of salt? 1= Borrowed from neighbors 2= Bought 3= Did without 4= Does not cook at all 5= Not applicable	What did your children below 5 years old (0-4 years) have for breakfast yesterday? 1= Tea/drink with sugar only 2= Milk/milk tea with sugar 3= Solid food only 4= Tea/drink with solid food 4= Tea/drink without sugar with solid food 6= Porridge with solid food 7= Porridge with sugar only 8= Porridge with milk 9= Porridge without sugar only 10= Nothing 11= Other (specify)	What did your children between 5 to 13 years old have for breakfast yesterday? USE CODE FROM COLUMN 9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Currently	01								
2001	02								

Reference period	Code	Was your household's economic activity affected by civil strife during last 12 months? 1= Yes 2= No	Was your household's economic activity affected by theft/violence or other similar attacks in the last 12 months? 1= Yes 2= No	Is any member of this household an LC1, LC2 or LC3 committee member? 1= Yes 2= No	Can other people in the village from your ethnic group be trusted? 1= Very great extent 2= Great extent 3= Neither great nor small extent 4= Small extent 5= Very small extent	What about people from a different ethnic group? 1= Very great extent 2= Great extent 3= Neither great nor small extent 4= Small extent 5= Very small extent
1	2	11	12	13	14	15
Currently	01					
2001	02					

Section 16: Major Shocks Experienced by the Household during the Past 5 Years

Description of distress events	Code	Did you experience [...] during the past 5 years? 1= Yes 2= No (>> NEXT ROW)	How many times during the past 5 years?	When did the most serious one occur? Year yyyy	How long did the most serious shock last? (months)	How did your household cope with this event? (multiple answers with rank)			If the same event happens today, for your household what types of coping strategies you are likely to resort to?			
						1st	2nd	3rd	USE THE SAME CODE AS 7			Overall, will it be easier or harder? 1= Much easier 2= Somewhat easier 3= About the same 4= Somewhat harder 5= Much harder
									1st	2nd	3rd	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7a	7b	7c	8a	8b	8c	9
Drought	101											
Floods/Hailstorm	102											
Pest attack	103											
Bad seed quality	104											
Livestock epidemic	105											
Fire accident	106											
Civil strife	107											
Robbery/theft	108											
Death of head of the household	109											
Death of other family members	110											
Injury from accidents	111											
Other (specify).....	112											
Other (specify).....												
Other (specify).....												
Other (specify).....												

Section 17: Non-agricultural Land by All Households and Agricultural Land by Non-agriculturalists (Ownership rights)

1a. Has any member of this household been growing any crop in the last 12 months?

1= Yes (>> 1c)
2= No

1b. Does any member of your household own any agricultural land?

1= Yes
2= No

1c. Does any member of your household own non-agricultural land holdings that include built-up, ponds, etc.?

1= Yes
2= No (If 1a=1 or 1b= 2, >> NEXT SECTION)

CHECK THE ANSWERS FOR 1b AND 1c, IF ATLEAST ONE OF THE ANSWERS IS "YES" THEN GIVE THE DETAILS BY PARCEL ONLY FOR THE YES ANSWER.

P A R C E L	What is the total area of this land in acres? START WITH HOMES TEAD PARCEL	Location 1= Within the EA/LC1 2= Outside EA but within same Parish 3= Outside Parish but within the S/County 4= Elsewhere in the district 5= Other district	Who is primarily using this land now? 1= I myself 2= A relative for free 3= A relative for payment 4= A stranger for free 5= A stranger for payment 6= Other (specify)	Tenure type 1= Freehold 2= Leasehold 3= Mailo 4= Customary 5= Other (specify)	Current primary use 1= Cultivated annual crops 2= Cultivated permanent crops 3= Grazing 4= Wetland 5= Fallow 6= Residential building 7= Business/ office building 8= Ponds 9= Other (Specify)	If you were to sell this land today (including the investment on it), how much could you sell it for?	If you were to rent this land today (including the investment on it), how much could you rent it out for one year?	Do you have the right to sell or transfer this land to someone else? 1= No right 2= Yes, With approval from local authority 3= Yes, With approval from extended family 4= Yes, With approval from my spouse and children 5= Yes, Without anybody's approval 6= Other (specify)	Could you use it as a loan security? 1= Yes 2= No (>> 13)	How much money can you borrow using this land (including the investment on it) as a security?	Does this land have a formal certificate? 1= Title (>> NEXT PARCEL) 2= Customary ownership (>> NEXT PARCEL) 3= None	Would you want to obtain a certificate? 1= Yes: Title 2= Yes: Customary ownership 3= No (>> NEXT PARCEL)	How much are you willing to pay to obtain a certificate?
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
01													
02													
03													
04													
05													
06													
07													
08													

Section 18: Link with the Agriculture Questionnaire

1. During the last completed cropping season (2nd Season of 2004: July – Dec. 2004) and the current cropping season (1st Season of 2005: Jan. – June 2005), has any member of your household cultivated crops including perennial crops (e.g. fruits) and feeding stuff (e.g. fodder leaves)?

1= Yes
2= No

2. During the last 12 months, has any member of your household raised livestock, poultry, or fishery?

2= No
1= Yes

INTERVIEWER:

(1) IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1 IS YES, THE AGRICULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED.

(2) IF ONLY THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS YES, THEN ONLY SECTION 10 AND 11 OF THE AGRICULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED.

(3) IF THE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 1 AND 2 ARE BOTH NO, THE AGRICULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD NOT BE ADMINISTERED TO THE HOUSEHOLD.

HRS

--	--	--	--