POVERTY ASSESSMENT SURVEY
UGANDA

Field Technical Report

N
ida
Nkoola
Institutional Development Associates
209 Upper Mawanda Rd.
Old Mulango Hill
P. O. Box 22130
Kampala, Uganda.
Tel./ Fax: 256 (0)41-530696
Email: consultus@nida.or.ug

IRIS Centre
University Research Corporation International
(URCI) College Park Maryland

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

EAs	**Enumeration Area**
ICBT	**Informal Cross Border Trade**
IDPs	**Internally Displaced People**
LC	**Local Council**
PPS	**Probability Proportion to Size**
UBOS	**Uganda Bureau of Statistics**

1 Introduction

Nkoola Institutional Development Associates (NIDA) was engaged by, the IRIS centre of the University Research Corporation International (URCI) College Park Maryland to conduct a survey on testing poverty assessment tools in Uganda. Data collection was completed and the data entered, and cleaned. This report presents the sampling procedures, summary of survey cases, and experiences in the data collection process.

1.1 Adaptation of the Questionnaires

The generic tools were adapted to Uganda situation during an interface with IRIS representatives (Prof. Manfred Zeller and Dr. Charity Irungu) in July 2004. The revised tools were used in training enumerators. A pre-testing exercise for the composite and benchmark tools was conducted in Goma Sub-county Mukono district while the community questionnaire was pre-tested in Nakawa Division Kampala district. Some useful insights came up during the training and pre-testing exercises and wherever applicable these were incorporated accordingly to produce the final versions used in the survey. The questionnaires were translated into five local languages namely: Luganda, Luo, Runyakitara, Lusoga, and Ateso.

Table 1: Translated Questionnaires by district they were administered.

Luganda	**Runyakitara**	**Lusoga**	**Luo**	**Ateso**
Mbarara	Mbarara	Kamuli	Masindi	Kumi
Rukungiri	Rukungiri	Iganga	Apac	Soroti
Bushenyi	Bushenyi	Bugiri	Nebbi	
Kabarole	Kabarole	Mayuge	Arua	
Kyenjojo	Kyenjojo	Mbale		
Hoima	Hoima			
Kibaale	Kibaale			
Mubende	Mubende			
Wakiso	Wakiso			
Luwero	Luwero			
Kampala	Kampala			
Mukono	Mukono			
Masaka	Masaka			
Rakai	Rakai			
Kamuli				
Iganga				
Bugiri				
Mayuge				
Mbale				

1.2 Sampling

Three stage sampling was used arrive at the respondents interviewed in this study. Stage one involved selection of districts, stage two focused on selecting enumeration areas while individual households that participated in the survey were the focus of stage three.

1.2.1 Sampling Districts and Sub-counties.

Sampling was tied to the administrative units in Uganda that include district, sub-county, parishes and communities (Local Council 1). As at the time of sampling, Uganda comprised of 56 districts spread in the 4 regions of the country namely central, western, eastern and northern. Sampling of districts and sub-counties was accomplished during the second week of July when both Manfred and Charity were in Uganda. Twenty-five (25) districts from which and progressively 25 sub-counties were randomly selected from 50 districts out of the 56 that make up Uganda. Due to security concerns in the northern region at the time of sampling, six districts namely Gulu, Kitgum, Kotido, Pader, Moroto, and Nakapiripirit were excluded from the sampling frame. For the same reason some counties/sub-counties from 3 other neighbouring districts, namely Lira, Apac, and Katakwi, were also excluded from the sampling frame. The sample was thus drawn by probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling method from the remaining 50 districts using the 2002 provisional population census data provided by Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). From each district, one sub-county was randomly selected using the same methodology. According to the 2002 provisional population census results, Uganda has approximately 24.75 Million people out of which 21.76 Million were included in the sampling frame while 2.98 million accounting for about 12.1% of the total population in the excluded districts/or counties (see exact figures and other details in the attached the excel file -Uganda sampling).

1.2.1 Selection of Enumeration Areas

Selection of enumeration areas was accomplished in the third week of July when Charity was still in Uganda. Employing probability proportional to size sampling technique, a total of 25 Enumeration Areas (EAs) were randomly selected from the sample sub-counties. Data on enumeration units was provided by UBOS from the 2002 provisional population Census results. The EAs by and large correspond to Local council 1 (LC1) which is the lowest administrative unit in Uganda. The parish where the selected EA is located automatically became the sample parish. Out of the 25 selected EAs, 22 fall in the rural category while 3 EAs fall in the urban category according to the UBOS classification[1]. The three

[1] Urban areas include the entire Kampala District, all municipalities, all district towns, all gazeted Town Councils and Town Boards and other big Trading centres.

urban EAs account for 12% of the sampled EAs more or less the same proportion as the urban population in Uganda's total population.

1.2.3 Selection of Individual Households

Selection of individual households in an Enumeration Area (EA) was done by the supervisors and the enumerators prior to field data collection using systematic random sampling based on registers of households in the custody of Local Council 1 (LC1) executive committee members as the sampling frame. With the exception of Gogobe LC1 in Seeta Parish Mukono district, sampling was based on a sampling frame that comprised of households that were found existing in the village registers, obtained from the village committee leadership or one developed by the survey team but with the help of the local council leadership (Copies of the lists are provided with the sets of questionnaires from each community). Systematic sampling with a step- size determined by the total number of households, numbered consecutively from 1 up to the last figure was used. The first sampled household in each community was determined using small pieces of papers numbering 1 to 10, folded and one randomly picked by any member(s) of the community available during the sampling process. The household corresponding to the number on the selected piece was then used as household one in the sub-sample in that EA. The subsequent household would follow a regular step size consecutively running through the list until the required sample size was obtained. In addition four extra households were selected to cater for non-respondents. In the event of non-respondents, the first household among the extras was used to replace the non -respondent household.

In Mukono district, where the village was very big in terms of households and given that it is in a high concentration rural – urban setting, the sampling considered stepwise selection. Here, a village map was drawn and sub-villages were clearly marked. A pencil perpendicularly standing on its nib was then freely dropped to select the sub-village that happened to be in the direction or location where its nib pointed after resting. Households in the sub – village were then listed and the sampling process done using the systematic sampling procedure.

This way a total of 32 households were selected in each of the 25 sample enumeration areas, parishes, sub-counties and districts thereby giving a total of 800 households targeted in the study.

1.3 Data Collection

Data collection was undertaken between August 4, 2004 and October 25, 2004. A team of 21 enumerators and three supervisors participated in data collection exercise. Data collection was preceded by orientation of the team on the tools and procedures for data collection in a three day in house training session followed by two days of pre-testing the tools. The team was sub-divided into

three main sub-teams, one for central and western, a second team for northern and third team for eastern. Team members by region are given in table 2 below

Table 2: Team members by region

Central-Western Team	Eastern	Northern
William Nanyenya Ntege (supervisor)	Peter Fuuna (supervisor)	Catherine Anena (supervisor)
Rebecca Najjero	Miriam Kyotalimye	Denis Okot
Annette Nabengo	Balaza Patrick	Geria James
Jackie Naggayi	Noe Dankaine	Lilian Ogen
Ramzy Magambo	Martin Ameu	Mary Amony
Olivia Nassali	Maurice Olupoti	
David Ssebatya	Deogratiaus Egiru	
Lukusa Cliente		
Moses Taremwa		
Shabwomwe Patience		
Raymond Kyanda		
Elizabeth Dabya		

1.3.1 Summary of Survey Cases

By and large data collection was completed on schedule. Community as well as price questionnaires were administered in all the 25 enumeration areas. A total of 800 household interviewed using the composite tool while 792 benchmark questionnaires were administered to the sample households. Each household was interviewed twice first with the composite two and the benchmark questionnaire after 13-15 days. A shortfall - of 8 cases arise due to non-responses that emerged during the data collection for the benchmark tool. Cases 421, 604, 622, and 623 were not in their respective villages at time of administering the benchmark as they were reported to have gone to attend to burials for their relatives. Case 135 had shifted to a new location outside the village while case 151 passed away leaving behind small grand children who could not provide the information. The household head for case 180 accepted to do the composite but changed his mind and declined to be interviewed for the benchmark questionnaire.

1.4 Data Management

Data entry was done using SPSS Data Builder version 4. In all cases the data was entered twice. For the benchmark data 18 out of the 25 districts, data was entered twice using the double entry function of the SPSS data builder program. The remaining seven districts namely Kabarole, Mbarara, Mayuge, Bugiri, Iganga, Kamuli and Mbale data was entered in different files and latter compared for consistence. Likewise for the majority of the composite questionnaires except Mbarara, Rakai, Masaka and Luwero, data was entered twice into different files and the file compare function of the SPSS data builder was used to compare the

files. Inconsistencies unearthed in this process were compared with the questionnaire and used to eliminate any errors made during data entry.

2. Reflections on tools based on field experiences

1. Community questionnaire

In all the communities visited, it was the village Local Council (LC) committee members and opinion leaders who were contacted and interviewed on community issues. In Uganda, all villages are managed by LC1committees with respect to local administrative, legal and mobilization issues. In all cases a village has a centrally agreed, common local meeting place where members converge to deliberate on matters of common interest to the community as and when the need arises. Therefore, the issue of presence of an LC center was, as expected affirmative

In some very remote rural places like in Kyenjojo district, Day Care Centers were not common. The village folk felt that such facilities could probably only be found at the district main town

With respect to locations, they were restricted to either rural or urban yet some were urban – rural and rural – urban .A case in point is the villages of Bukoboli, in Iganga district and Busowa, in Bugiri district that were categorized as rural when in reality they are 3km and 4km respectively from the district town centre. Slum dwellings, as was the case for Kisenyi in Kampala district were not catered for let alone villages where internally displaced people (IDPs), had been integrated into the communities as was the case in Masindi and Apac districts.

2. Price questionnaire

The requirement of administering this questionnaire to multiple respondents was done on the same questionnaire. This is because the items contained there in could not be obtained from a single selling/distribution point. Some items were stocked in shops, village stalls/kiosks, market stalls, butcheries, wheel barrow/bicycle or on- foot hawkers or even bought from the primary producers (farmers).

For items with standard measurements like kilograms, meters and litres their prices were similar from whatever seller in the locality. This standardization was arrived at with the help of a metric system got from the Informal Cross Border Trade (ICBT) survey units of measure for various items. This was particularly important because the different communities had many different measurement units. Most of such items were being sold in small trading centers in ordinary outlets - with no additional special services to justify premium prices – and where information flow among traders and consumers themselves would create a situation of perfect competition that tended to make them charge uniform prices.

For other items like bananas, the price taken was for an average size transacted during normal pricing periods (outside supply scarcity or slumping extremes due to over supply).

3. Composite questionnaire

B15 The recall period of 12 months was rather long to establish all purchases made especially for big families that make several purchases. The fact that the question had several items combined in one implied that no straightforward answer would be elicited. In most cases the respondent had to take time thinking through the items in order to provide an answer. This demanded patience and probing from the enumerators in order to get a good enough estimate

C13 The figure of shs 1500 was very insignificant for well to do families since it could not influence their expenditure patterns. They could easily indicate that they use it all for food, or just a bottle of beer yet the poor households could afford to spare some of it to meet other petty expenses. This could lead to reversal of common knowledge and logic that suggests that the poor people's marginal propensity to consume is higher than that for the rich since the poor spend larger proportions of their additional income on food as compared to the rich. Therefore, for comparison purposes another realistic figure could have been floated to take into consideration the expenditure patterns of the relatively well to do households.

D1a and 1b: The respondents were not exposed to property valuation because renting and selling of houses and homesteads is uncommon particularly in typical rural or remote areas. Figures were extracted with great difficulty hence interpretation of the estimates should take this into consideration.

D 5: The estimation of houses in square feet was not easy to some respondents due to lack of experience and or exposure in estimating lengths and widths without using tape measures especially for the female respondents. In most cases therefore, the enumerators had to either physically take the measurements or observe and make estimates.

E15: In Uganda it is difficult to distinguish between the actual foodstuffs consumed by the poor and the rich. Some foods like Mukene and Katunkuma listed as a preserve for the poor are also medicinal, highly nutritious and are consumed by the rich too. Others are seldom eaten so as to have food variety. What ought to be born in mind here is that the frequency and or purpose of consumption of a particular foodstuff, location, culture and availability will come into play. A case in point is that while the poor will frequently consume mukene or greens (dodo) as the main sauce, the rich will have them as a supplement or side dish. More so for the rich, animal proteins and fat are consumed frequently on almost a daily basis yet the poor have to wait for the festive periods to set hand on them. These facts had to be kept in mind by the enumerators making time of interface with respondents even longer.

F1: Estimating unsurveyed family lands with no title deeds especially in areas where land fragmentation was rampant, in decimals and attaching monetary values was not easy even for the occupants themselves. This was more pronounced in cases where the sample households were utilising family land, and communal lands.

G 1. 7 The question of death of family members sometimes evoked bad memories and caused discomfort particularly if the dead were very close to the respondent and had been playing a significant role in the household's socio-economic wellbeing.

K1.1 and K1.2 relate to money kept at home and savings at bank. There was difficulty in instilling confidence in the respondents so as to get them to reveal their actual financial base especially, to people still considered strangers. Culturally, respondents are either too shy to reveal how badly off they may be financially yet by stating high figures they risked appearing boastful to visitors who perhaps had something to offer. Therefore, assurance on confidence and confidentiality, coupled with intense probing was required to elicit an appropriate and plausible response.

4. Benchmark questionnaire

Unconventional units of some foodstuffs make it difficult to be clear on what exact sizes were being referred to. For example, onions, passion fruits, garlic, oranges, ginger, and tomatoes can be sold in small heaps for shs 100/=, 500/= and bigger ones for 1000/=. Likewise, some liquid items like local and industrial brews, paraffin and cooking oil are sold in small and varying denominations such as cups/glasses/tots of about 50 mls. Other items like green vegetables and bundles of firewood presented a measurement difficulty since the sizes varied according to season and or region. Standardisation to metric units where applicable was achieved using measurements sourced from the ICBT survey as the base (see annex 1).

In reality, both the food and sauce bought in restaurants are priced together or jointly charged. However, with respect to the questionnaire, only the food items are projected. It therefore becomes difficult to distinguish between the sauce and the food in terms of price rates especially, given that it is the type of source that in most cases determines the price of the food package on a plate.

It was also difficult to estimate food eaten by household members outside the household itself. Such consumption is considered negligible and rarely declared although in a week, given all the benefiting members it may translate into some reasonable amount, in terms of food quantities and money.

Annex 1: ICBT SURVEY UNITS OF MEASURE FOR VARIOUS ITEMS

Item	**Unit**	**Measures of items**
Maize grain	Sack(100kg)	100kg
	Basin	15kg
	Trough/Katasa	5kg
	Tin-Big(Debe)	15kg
	Tin-Small(Nomi/Paint)	3kg
	Basket-Medium	18kg
Fresh maize	Sack Full	40kg
	Basin	5kg
	Tin-Big(Debe)	5kg
	Basket-Medium	7kg
Maize flour	Sack(100kg)	100kg
	Katasa	3kg
	Basin-Small like Katasa	5kg
Millet grain	Full Sack	120kg
	Sack-3/4 way	100kg
	Sack-1/2 way	60-75kg
	Basin	20kg
	Tin-Big	20kg
	Trough/Katasa	3kg
	Gologolo/Paint tin	3kg
	Nomi Tin	2kg
Millet Finger	Sack Full	20kg
	Basket-Big	5kg
Millet Flour	Sack Full	100kg
	Basin	20kg
	Tin-Debe	20kg
	Katasa	3kg
	Gologolo	2kg
Wheat Flour	Packets	2kg
	Carton	12pkts
Wheat Grain	Sack Full	120kg
	¾ Sack	100kg
	½ Sack	60-75kg
	1/4	40kg
Cassava Flour	Sack Full	100kg
	Katasa	3kg
	Basin-small like Katasa	5kg
Cassava dry	Extra Full-sabasaba	100kg
	Sack Full	60kg
	Basin	10kg
Cassava Fresh	Sack-Extra Big	150kg
	Sack-Big	120kg
Beans(dry)	Sack Full	100kg

Item	Unit	Measures of items
	Basin	20kg
	Tin	20kg
	Kavera(500shs)	25-35kg
	Kavera(200shs)	15kg
	Kavera(100shs)	5kg
Fresh beans-Unshelled	Sack Full	40kg
	Basin	4kg
Shelled beans	Tin	10-12kg
	Basin	10-12kg
	Kavera(200shs)	10kg
	Kavera(100shs)	5kg
Matooke	Small bunches west	14kg
	Medium bunches west	28kg
	Big bunches west	38kg
	Small bunches north	8kg
	Medium bunches north	22kg
	Big bunches north	32kg
	Small bunches east	12kg
	Medium bunches east	26kg
	Big bunches east	32kg
	Small bunches south	14kg
	Medium bunches south	28kg
	Big bunches south	38kg
Bogoya	Cluster	2.5-4kg
	Small/Medium 8 clusters	3.5x8
	Big 12 Clusters	3.5x12
Gonja	One bunch on average	10kg
Sweet bananas	Cluster	1kg
	Small bunch 5 clusters	5kg
	Big bunch 8 clusters	8kg
Rice as Wheat		
Sorghum as Millet		
Soya beans/peas as Beans		
Irish potatoes	Full Sack	100-120kg
	Basin	20kg
	Basket	8kg
	Tin-Debe	20kg
	Kavera(200shs	20kg
Sweet potatoes as Irish		
Tomatoes	Tin/Debe	15kg

Item	Unit	Measures of items
	Basin	15kg
	Trough/Katasa	3kg
	Big pallet 6Tins of 15kg	90kg
	Medium pallet 4 Tins of 15kg	60kg
	Small pallet 2 Tins of 15kg	30kg
	Kavera 200shs	6kg
	Kavera 100shs	3kg
Onions	Bundle	1-3kg
	Transparent nets	20kg
	Basin	18kg
	Sack	100kg
	Tin(Big)	18kg
Avocado	Basket	10kg
	Sack	80kg
	Basin	15kg
	Kavera 200shs	8kg
	Kavera 100shs	3kg
	Katasa	5kg
Pineapples	Big	3kg
	Small	1kg
	Medium	2kg
Passion Fruits	Sack	70-100kg
	Basin	10kg
	Tin	10kg
Mangoes as Avocado		
Jack Fruit	Average Size	6kg
Sugar Cane	10 canes in Bundle	25kg
	Short Cane	2kg
	Long Cane	3kg
Water melon	1 melon	3kg
	Vehicles(Tonnage)	Tonne
Pumpkins as Water Melon		
Coffee	Sack clean/FAQ	100KG
	Sack kiboko	60kg
	Basin kiboko	10kg
	Basin clean/FAQ	15kg

Item	Unit	Measures of items
Animals	Numbers	
Fish(Dry)	Bundles Small sundry(12Pcs)	3kg
	Bundles Big sundry(60Pcs)	18kg
Smoked Fish Tilapia	Stick	150gms
	Basket(Small)	50kg
	Basket(Big)	100kg
	Boxes(paper)-Small	50kg
	Boxes(Paper)-Big	100kg
	Sack-Mukene	70kg
	Basin-Mukene	8kg
Fresh Tilapia	Small Basket	50kg
	Big Basket	100kg
	Bundle of 3 fish	1kg
	1 Big can weigh	5-8kg
Fresh Fish Nile Perch	Small	3kg
	Medium	15kg
	Big	40kg
Smoked Nile Perch	Basket(Small)	50kg
	Basket(Big)	100kg
	Boxes(Paper)-Small	50kg
	Boxes(Paper)-Big	100kg
Tea	Bag	70kg
	Kavera(200shs)	3kg
Tobacco	Bundle(5 small bundles)	1kg
Malewa/Young Bamboo Shoots	Bundle(5 small bundles)	1/4kg
	4 Bundles of 5 small bundles	1kg
Eggs	Tray (30 Eggs)	2kg
	Banana Fibres(Heap 40 Eggs)	3kg
	Wooden Boxes(20 Trays)	40kg
Meat/Beef	Thigh	50kg

Item	Unit	Measures of items
Charcoal	Sack	40kg
	Basin	5kg
Waragi	Jerry cans	20-Litre
	“	10-Litre
	“	5-Litre
	“	2-Litre
Milk	Cans	40-Litre
		20-Litre
		5-Litre
Timber	9`x`1`	Piece
	6`x2`	Piece
	12`x1`	Piece
	4`x3`	Piece
Commonly used	4`x2`	Piece
“	3`x2`	Piece
Poles as Timber		
Firewood	Average log of Eucalyptus	20kg
Clothes	Bale	100kg
	Bitenge	Pieces/Numbers
Beer	Crate	25 Bottles
	Bottle	300mls
	Can	300mls
Soda	Crate	24 Bottles
	Bottle	300mls
	Can	300mls
Mineral Water	Bottle(s)	0.5,1 and 1.5 Litre bottles
Soap(Bar)	Carton	25 Bars
Soap(Toilet)	Tablet(s)	Varying grams
Detergents	Liquid form	Litre(s)
	Powder form	Kg(s_
ASSORTED VEGETABLES		
Carrots	Sack	80kg
	Basin	15kg
	Basket	15kg

Item	Unit	Measures of items
	Bundle(With leaves)	1kg
Cabbages	Sack	50kg
	Average Drum head	1kg
Other Greens	2 small Bundles	1kg
Honey	Jerry can	20-Litre
	Bottle(s)	1 Litre
	Beer bottle	500mls
	Soda bottle	300mls
Plastic Ware	Jerry cans(Specify size)	Pieces
	Basins	Pieces
	Katasa	Pieces
	Plates	Dozens/Pieces
	Cups	Dozens/Pieces
Non-Plastic Ware	Plates	Dozens/Pieces
	Mugs	Pieces/Sets
	Cups	Pieces/Sets
Cigarettes	Carton	20 Bombas
	Bomba	20 Packets
	Packet	20 Sticks
Parraffin	Jerry can	20 Litre
	“	10 Litre
	“	5 Litre
	“	2 Litre
	Jerry can/Tin	1 Litre
Petrol	Jerry can	20 Litre
	“	10 Litre
	“	5 Litre
	“	2 Litre
Diesel as Paraffin and Petrol		
Sugar	Sack	50kg
	Packet	2kg
	Packet	1kg
Mattresses	6`x`6`	Piece
	6`x`4`	Piece
	6`x`2`	Piece
	5`x`6`	Piece

Item	Unit	Measures of items
Battery Cells	Carton	12 Boxes
	Small Box	3 Pairs
	Small (specify according to type)	
	Small Box	6 Pairs
Sauce Pans	Sets/Pieces	Varying Sizes
Blankets	Specify according to quality and size	Piece
Blue Band	Big Tin	1kg
	Medium Tin	500gms
	Small Tin	250gms
Salt Refined	Carton	50 Sachets
	Sachet	500gms
Bread	Big Loaf	1kg
	Small Loaf	1/2kg
	Buns(12)	1kg
Tyres	Bicycle	Piece
	Motor Cycle	Piece
	Motor Vehicle	Piece
	Tractor	Piece
	Bus	Piece
STATOINERY		
Books	Exercise Books	Dozens/Pieces
	Note Books	Dozens/Pieces
	Text Books	Pieces
Paper	Duplicating	Ream
	Photocopying/Printing	Ream/Pieces
Pens/Pens		Packets/Pieces
Iron Sheets	Gauge(28 and 32)	Pieces
	Bundle(16 Iron Sheets-Gauge 32)	Bundle
Handcrafts		Pieces
Match Boxes	Bomba	10 Packets
	Packet	10 Pieces
Vehicle Spare Parts		Pieces
Nails		Kg
Cement	Bag	Kg
Non-Alcoholic Beverages	Jerry can	5 Litres
	Jerry can	3 Litres
	Jerry can	2 Litres
	Jerry can	1 Litres
Tooth Paste		Pieces/Cartons/Dozens
Tooth Brushes		Pieces/Boxes
Suit Case		Pieces
Bulbs/Tubes		Pieces/Cartons
Slippers		Pairs