



**UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS**



**UGANDA NATIONAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY  
1999/2000**

**REPORT ON THE**

**COMMUNITY SURVEY**

Uganda Bureau of Statistics  
P.O. Box 13  
Entebbe  
Tel: 320165, 320320  
Fax: 320147  
E-mail: [ubos@infocom.co.ug](mailto:ubos@infocom.co.ug)  
Website: [www.ubos.org](http://www.ubos.org)

January 2001

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Table of contents .....	Page I
	List of Tables .....	Page ii
	Preface .....	Page iii
	Excutive Summary .....	Page iv
1.1	Introduction .....	Page 1
1.2	Characteristics of the LC 1's .....	Page 1
1.3	Access to Markets .....	Page 2
1.3.1	Access to Consumer Markets .....	Page 2
1.3.2	Markets for Agricultural (Crop Farming) Inputs .....	Page 3
1.3.3	Producer Markets .....	Page 4
1.4	Distance to Markets in Rural Areas .....	Page 5
1.5	Prices of Agricultural Produce .....	Page 5
1.6	Prices of Agricultural Inputs .....	Page 6
1.7	Prices of Consumer Goods .....	Page 7
1.8	Migration Characteristics .....	Page 7
1.9	Access to Social Infrastructure .....	Page 8
1.10	Access to Credit Facilities .....	Page 10
1.10.1	Sources of Credit .....	Page 10
1.10.2	Security Requirements .....	Page 11
1.10.3	Access to Credit by Women .....	Page 12
1.11	Agricultural Characteristics in Rural Areas .....	Page 12
1.11.1	Availability of Agricultural Land .....	Page 12
1.11.2	Type of Land Tenure .....	Page 12
1.11.3	Use of Improved Seeds for Staple Food Crops .....	Page 13
1.11.4	Use of Ox Ploughs .....	Page 13
1.11.5	Use of Tractors for Cultivation .....	Page 14
1.11.6	Farmers Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers .....	Page 14
1.11.7	Wage Rates .....	Page 15
2	Education and Health Infrastructure .....	Page 16
2.1	Education .....	Page 16
2.2	Health Characteristics .....	Page 18
1.3	Conclusion .....	Page 19

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Percentage of LC 1's by characteristics, 1999/00 .....	Page 1
Table 1.2	Characteristics of LC 1's by Region, 1999/00 (%) .....	Page 2
Table 1.3	Markets Located within the LC 1 (%) .....	Page 3
Table 1.4	Input Markets Located Within the LC 1's (%) .....	Page 3
Table 1.5	Selling Practices of Agricultural Inputs by Region, 1999/00 (%) .....	Page 4
Table 1.6	Output Markets Located Within the LC 1's (%) .....	Page 4
Table 1.7	Selling Practice of Agricultural Produce, 1999/00 (%) .....	Page 5
Table 1.8	Average Distance (kms) to the Nearest Rural Market, 1999/00 .....	Page 5
Table 1.9	Average Price of Agricultural Produce in Rural Areas (1999/00) .....	Page 6
Table 1.10	Average Price of Agricultural Inputs in the Rural Areas .....	Page 6
Table 1.11	Average Price of Consumer Goods in Uganda, 1999/00 .....	Page 7
Table 1.12	Type of Migration (%) – 1999/00 .....	Page 8
Table 1.13	Reason for Migration (%) – 1999/00 .....	Page 8
Table 1.13	Average Distance to Infrastructure Facilities (1999/00) .....	Page 9
Table 1.15	Average Distance to Infrastructure Facilities (1999/00) .....	Page 9
Table 1.16	Availability of Credit Facilities .....	Page 10
Table 1.17	Communities Reporting the Existence of Credit (%) – 1999/00 .....	Page 11
Table 1.18	Communities Reporting the Security Requirement .....	Page 11
Table 1.19	Access to Credit by Women .....	Page 12
Table 1.20	Land Availability .....	Page 12
Table 1.21	Type of Land Tenure .....	Page 13
Table 1.22	Proportion of Farmers using Improved Seeds .....	Page 13
Table 1.23	Proportion of Farmers using Ox Ploughs .....	Page 14
Table 1.24	Proportion of Communities where farmers use Tractors ...	Page 14
Table 1.25	Proportion of Farmers Visited by Extension Agents .....	Page 15
Table 1.26	Wage Rates Per Day .....	Page 15
Table 2.1	Basic Characteristics of Primary Schools (1999/00) .....	Page 17
Table 2.2	Basic Characteristics Relating to Primary Schools (1999/00) ..	Page 18
Table 2.3	Basic Characteristics of Health Facilities by Residence (1999/2000) .	Page 19

# PREFACE

This is the community survey report of the Uganda National Household Survey 1999/2000 (UNHS 1999/2000) conducted by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics. The survey is the latest in a series of household surveys initiated in 1992/93 to collect socio-economic data at household and community levels. The survey components vary between surveys. The UNHS 1999/2000 comprised of the agriculture (crop), socio-economic and community components. It was a nation-wide survey, which covered about 10,700 households from August 1999 to July 2000. The Bureau released preliminary findings on some aspects of the survey in an intermediate report in May 2000.

The purpose of this report is to present the community component of the UNHS 1999/00 survey, on different socio-economic characteristics of communities such as price of consumer goods, agricultural inputs and agricultural produce, access to credit facilities, etc. In addition, information on the general characteristics of the LC 1's, marketing of agricultural produce, and the availability of markets as well as prices of agricultural produce, consumer goods and agricultural inputs, migration characteristics, economic infrastructure, access to credit facilities, social infrastructure i.e. education, health, and other amenities is presented.

Importance is attached to presenting the statistical information in a comprehensive and illustrative manner that makes this report suitable for use in many situations. The report presents the main results and it is believed that it meets and strengthens some of the requirements for planning and policy formulation. There is still room for further analysis, and UBOS therefore encourages data users and analysts to do more definitive analysis on this wealth of data. Linking the community survey data to the socio-economic survey data is one way of doing this further analysis.

We are most grateful to the World Bank Consultants, Messrs Klaus Deininger, Tim Marchant, Bart Minten, Rob Townsend and the Acting Director, Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Makerere University, Dr. John Okidi, for their technical advice. We also appreciate the services of the survey design Consultant, Mr. S. K. Gupta. We thank Consultants from Statistics Denmark, Ms. Lisbeth Laursen and Carsten Torpe for their advice on data cleaning and dissemination. We thank the World Bank for having funded the Survey and the Government of Uganda for the counter-part funding. We would also like to express our gratitude to the staff of the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) who worked tirelessly to plan and implement the survey and to the respondents for their co-operation.

Mr. J. B. Male-Mukasa  
**Executive Director**

**January, 2001**

# Executive Summary

## Background

The community survey aimed at collecting data on characteristics of Local Councils (LC 1), consumer markets, farm input markets and produce outlets, demographic information relating to communities residing in the sampled Enumeration Areas (EA) and various details on economic and social infrastructure in those areas.

## Characteristics of LC1s

Most of the communities were reported to in rural settings. It was reported that 88 percent of the communities were in rural atmosphere. A big percentage of the rural communities has scattered houses.

## Access to markets

There was generally good access to consumer markets which catering for the day to day household needs. The proportion of communities that reported having such markets within the LC 1 was 72 percent. Eighty-five percent of the communities had markets within a walkable distance of up to 1 km.

The input markets where farmers can purchase inputs like hoes, pangas, fertilizers, seeds, etc. are generally not available at the community level. The most common markets where such items are commonly found were reported in 4 percent of all the communities.

The output markets where farmers sell their produce are not common at community level. Thirty-nine percent of the communities sold their produce within the community to traders at the farm.

## Migration

The most important reason for migration was due to economic reasons. Seventy-one percent of all the surveyed communities reported that seeking better economic opportunities was the main cause of in-migration while 51 percent were for out-migration.

## Access to social infrastructure

On average, tarred roads were still far from communities whereby the average distance to such roads was 22 kilometres. However, this was an improvement as compared to 32 kilometers in 1997. Taxis/*matatu* were more accessible than buses whereby, the average distance was 6 kilometers as compared to 12 kilometres for buses. Banks are sparsely distributed, as the average distance from the communities was 29 kilometers.

## Access to credit facilities

Relatives/friends and *Entandikwa* credit scheme was reported as the mostly available sources of credit to members of the communities. Forty-seven percent of the communities reported the availability of credit from relatives/friends while the *Entandikwa* credit scheme was reported at 25 percent. The availability of credit to members of the community from banks was reported at 17 percent.

Three-quarters of the loans obtained from relatives/friends did not require security. This depicts the informal nature of such loans. Land and other assets were most common type security for loans obtained from banks (95 percent).

### **Agricultural characteristics**

Use of improved seeds for staple food crops was not common for most of the communities. The most common type of land tenure was unregistered free mailo in central, eastern and western while northern had customary type of tenure (98 percent). Sixty-two percent of the communities had none of the farmers visited by agricultural extension workers.

### **Education**

Generally, there is easy access to primary schools where the average distance from the communities was reported at 1.4 kilometres. Government aided primary schools were reported at 85 percent. Forty-two percent of the communities reported having at least one school in the community. Urban schools were reported with more qualified teachers than rural schools.

### **Health**

The average distance to a health facility was reported at 5 km from the community. The rural communities had to travel on average 6 km to the clinic compared to 2 km in urban areas. A big proportion of the health facilities surveyed had most of the basic medical necessities like malaria drugs, antibiotics, oral re-hydration packages, and equipment to sterilize needles.

# Community Survey Report

## 1.1: Introduction

The Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS 1999/2000) had a community survey component that was administered at the Local Council 1 (LC 1) level in each community in the selected Enumeration Area (EA). The questionnaires that were administered in the selected LC 1's gathered a wide range of information from the communities like access to markets, availability and price of consumer goods, agricultural inputs and agricultural produce, access to credit facilities, etc.

In addition, information was gathered from schools and medical facilities that served the particular LC 1 or village. The respondents of the survey were knowledgeable opinion leaders in the communities and for institutions the respondents were the institutional personnel like the head teachers of schools and the medical personnel at the health centres.

This report presents the findings of the community survey and they include: general characteristics of the LC 1's, marketing of agricultural produce, and the availability of markets as well as prices of agricultural produce, consumer goods and agricultural inputs, migration characteristics, economic infrastructure, access to credit facilities, social infrastructure i.e. education, health, and other amenities.

## 1.2: Characteristics of the LC 1's

**Most communities live in a rural setting**

Table 1.1 shows the distribution of LC 1's by their characteristics. It can be seen that in the rural areas, 89 percent of the LC 1's were located in a setting with scattered or clustered houses and huts, while in the urban areas 91 percent of the communities were located in an urban or semi-urban setting. Overall, 88 percent of LC 1's were in rural setting while 12 percent were in urban setting.

**Table 1.1: Percentage of LC 1's by characteristics, 1999/00**

	Uganda		
	Rural	Urban	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Rural setting with mostly scattered houses/huts	62	4	56
Rural setting with some clustered and some scattered houses/huts	27	1	24
Rural setting with mostly clustered houses/huts	8	4	8
Semi-urban setting	3	33	6
Urban setting	0	58	6

**Urbanisation is more prevalent in the central region**

The distribution of LC 1's by their characteristics by region is shown in Table 1.2. In the central region 26 percent of the communities were located in an urban setting, compared with 10 percent in the eastern

region, 7 percent in the northern region and 5 percent in the western region. Conversely, while in the central region 74 percent of the communities are located in a rural setting, the corresponding percentage is 90 percent in the eastern region 94 percent in the northern region, and 95 percent in the western region.

**Table 1.2: Characteristics of LC 1's by Region, 1999/00**

	Region			
	C	E	N	W
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Rural setting with mostly scattered houses/huts	44	65	52	63
Rural setting with some clustered and some scattered Houses/huts	25	17	22	30
Rural setting with mostly clustered houses/huts	5	8	20	2
Semi-urban setting	11	5	5	3
Urban setting	15	5	2	2

*C=Central, E=Eastern, N=Northern, W=Western*

## 1.3 Access to Markets

### 1.3.1 Access to Consumer Markets

The Uganda Poverty Status Report (1999) mentions that one of the methods of reducing rural poverty is to improve their access to markets. These markets serve as a source of inputs into the agricultural process and as a point of selling their output. Access to output markets enables farmers to get better prices for their products.

**Proximity to trading centres important for access to consumer markets**

Table 1.3 shows the availability of different consumer markets within the community. A limited consumer market is defined as a cluster of shops that deal with a limited number of fast selling items. Periodic local markets are held at fixed stations at fixed intervals where producers, traders and buyers converge and transact business. The most common market is the market where people of the LC 1 buy most of their commodities.

At the national level, there was a slight increase in the availability of limited consumer markets within the LC 1. Eastern region showed a remarkable increase from 43 percent to 80 percent between 1997 and 1999/00. However, similar markets in the northern region decreased from 74 percent to 57 percent between that period and a slight decline of 4 percentage points in the western region.

There was good access to consumer markets because a market within the LC 1 is assumed to be within walking distance. Access to consumer markets was better in the central, eastern and western regions. On the other hand, periodic local markets, which offer a wide range of goods at relatively lower prices, were more widespread in the northern and eastern regions. The most common markets were more prevalent in the western region with 10 percent of LC 1's having most common markets located

within the LC 1. The northern region had the least proportion of most common markets located in the LC 1's (4 percent).

**Table 1.3: Consumer Markets Located in LC 1 (%)**

	1997			1999/00		
	Limited Consumer Market	Consumer Periodic Local Market	Most common Market	Limited Consumer Market	Consumer Periodic Local Market	Most common Market
	Percent					
<b>Uganda</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
Central	82	13	16	89	9	5
Eastern	43	11	11	80	12	7
Northern	74	22	1	57	17	4
Western	81	4	4	77	4	10

### 1.3.2 Markets for Agricultural (Crop Farming) Inputs

#### No major changes in the types of input markets

These are markets where farmers purchase agricultural inputs in rural communities. Trader selling at farm refers to traders coming to the farmers to sell farm inputs for cash or barter. If the trader provides inputs at the farm site on credit to be recovered later through barter or cash, he/she was referred to as creditor at farm. Local co-operatives refer to both registered and un-registered co-operatives. The most common market is a specialised agricultural market where most of the needed farm inputs are available.

There were no major differences in the purchase of agricultural inputs at the LC 1 level between 1997 and 1999/00 as shown in Table 1.4.

**Table 1.4: Input Markets Located Within LC 1s (%)**

Type of markets	Input market			
	1997		1999/00	
	Percent			
	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1
Trader at farm	1	99	3	97
Creditor at farm	1	99	1	99
Local Co-operatives	8	92	9	91
Periodic market	9	91	7	93
Most common market	2	98	4	96

#### Poor Access to Agricultural Input markets

Table 1.5 shows that there was little purchase of agricultural inputs at the community level. This is because there were very few communities with an agricultural trader within the LC 1. Only 3 percent of the LC 1's in Uganda reported having traders selling agricultural inputs at farm-gate. Only 1

percent of the LC 1's reported trader selling agricultural inputs on credit to farmers at farm-gate.

**Table 1.5: Selling Practices of Agricultural Inputs (%) - 1999/00**

	Within LC 1			
	Selling at Farm		Credit at Farm	
	Percent			
	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1
<b>Uganda</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>99</b>
Central	2	98	0*	100
Eastern	4	96	0*	100
Northern	0	100	0	100
Western	5	95	2	98

\* Percentage is so small it rounds to zero.

### 1.3.3 Producer Markets

**Sell of agricultural produce at farm-gate is common**

This information relates to the marketing practices of farmers in the rural communities. Table 1.6 shows that most of the agricultural produce was purchased by traders at farm-gate. However the purchase has declined by about 10 percentage points while selling on credit slightly increased from 6 percent to 10 percent between 1997 and 1999/00.

**Table 1.6: Output Markets Located in LC 1s (%)**

Type of market	Output market			
	1997		1999/00	
	Percent			
	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1
Trader at farm	47	53	39	61
Creditor at farm*	6	94	10	90
Local Co-operatives	8	92	10	90
Periodic market	9	91	8	92
Most common market	3	97	4	96

\* Creditor at farm includes those traders who bought produce credit without having provided inputs on credit.

Table 1.7 shows that about 40 percent of the communities sold their output within the community to traders at farm-gate. The practice was relatively more spread in central region (55 percent) and least in the northern region (5 percent). Selling on credit was not wide spread.

Only 10 percent of all the communities reported selling of farm produce on credit. The selling of farm produce on credit was reported in 33 percent of the communities in the central region and is virtually non-existent in the northern region. This implies that a good proportion of agricultural produce

in this region was sold through other channels like local co-operatives, periodic local markets and general markets.

**Table 1.7 Selling Practice of Agricultural Produce, 1999/00 (%)**

	Within LC 1			
	Selling at Farm		Credit at Farm	
	Percent			
	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1	Available in the LC1	Not available in the LC1
<b>Uganda</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>90</b>
Central	55	45	33	67
Eastern	40	60	7	93
Northern	5	95	0*	100
Western	50	50	3	97

## 1.4 Distance to Markets in Rural Areas

**Consumer markets widely accessible in the rural areas**

The survey revealed that there is generally easy access to consumer markets. The average distance to such markets was only 1 km, as shown in Table 1.8. The average distance to the most common market for general consumer goods was 9.2 kilometres. However, for input and producer markets the average distance to the most common markets was longer at 10.4 km and 9.4 km respectively.

At regional level, the most common markets where commodities are widely available at a relatively cheaper price are nearest in the western region and furthest in the eastern region.

**Table 1.8: Average Distance (kms) to the Nearest Rural Market, 1999/00**

	Average Distance in Kms.				<b>Uganda</b>
	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
<b>General Consumer Markets</b>					
Limited Consumer Market	0.3	0.5	1.7	0.5	<b>0.7</b>
Periodic Local Market	5.2	4.0	5.7	5.0	<b>4.9</b>
Most common Market	9.5	12.2	11.4	4.9	<b>9.2</b>
<b>Agricultural Input Markets</b>					
Agricultural Input Market	7.0	8.2	14.1	4.9	<b>8.2</b>
Periodic Local Market	5.7	5.0	6.2	5.7	<b>5.6</b>
Local Co-operatives	2.7	0.8	2.0	8.4	<b>3.9</b>
Most Common Market	11.3	14.1	12.1	5.5	<b>10.4</b>
<b>Agricultural Producer Markets</b>					
Local Co-operatives	1.7	0.8	2.2	9.0	<b>3.8</b>
Periodic Local Market	5.7	4.0	4.8	5.2	<b>4.9</b>
Producer General Market	10.7	8.6	15.3	7.5	<b>10.2</b>
Most Common Market	11.4	12.7	9.1	5.6	<b>9.4</b>

## 1.5 Prices of Agricultural Produce

Markets serve as a medium through which prices are determined. Farmers with access to market information are more likely to demand for a better price than those who receive information from other sources. Also, the prices set in the markets have a direct effect on the farm-gate prices i.e. if the prices fall in the market, even the farm-gate prices are likely to fall. The survey collected prices on most important crops grown in the communities.

### Minimal variations in the prices of agricultural produce

Table 1.9 presents the average sale price of agricultural produce in the rural areas. Generally, the average prices of most agricultural produce did not vary much across regions except millet where the average price ranged from shs. 3,700 in eastern to shs. 7,800 central region.

**Table 1.9: Average Price (shs.) of Agricultural Produce in Rural Areas – 1999/00**

	Unit of measure	Region				Uganda
		Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	
Matooke	Bunch (medium)	3,600	3,300	*	3,200	3,200
Sweet potato	Tin <sup>+</sup>	2,700	1,900	*	2,100	2,400
Irish potatoes	Tin <sup>+</sup>	3,420	*	*	2,950	3,130
Coffee	Kg	360	690	*	660	510
Maize	Tin <sup>+</sup>	4,500	3,000	*	3,300	4,000
Millet	Tin <sup>+</sup>	7,800	3,700	*	5,700	6,500
Sorghum	Tin <sup>+</sup>	5,500	4,000	*	6,000	5,500
Rice	Kg	720	810	810	870	810
Beans	Kg	580	490	580	390	500
Ground nuts	Kg	1,340	1,250	1,010	1,040	1,210

\* Crop or unit of measure was not available in region

+ Refers to 20 litre tin (Debe)

## 1.6 Prices Agricultural Inputs

The average prices of selected agricultural inputs are presented in Table 1.10. Generally, prices of agricultural inputs seem to have been highest in the northern region.

### Price of the hoe was almost uniform

The price of the hoe, which is widely used by subsistence farmers, is fairly constant in all the regions of Uganda. The plough is widely available in the eastern and northern regions. Generally, the prices of agricultural inputs are higher in the northern region compared to other regions.

**Table 1.10: Price (shs.) of Agricultural Inputs - 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Hoe	3,200	3,100	3,500	3,100	3,200
Plough	n.a.	41,200	38,000	n.a.	40,100
Panga	2,700	2,800	2,400	2,500	2,600
Wheelbarrow	30,000	32,000	38,000	20,000	29,000
Bicycle	78,000	75,000	98,000	71,000	79,000

Values have been adjusted to the nearest 100 shillings; n. a = not available.

## 1.7 Prices of consumer goods

**Consumer prices are low in the northern region**

Information was collected on the prices of some selected consumer items used in the community as shown in Table 1.11. Prices of sugar, salt, and soap were fairly constant across the regions. Disparities were more observed in the prices of bulls, goats, sheep and chicken, with the eastern region having the highest prices of bulls and cows.

**Table 1.11: Average Price of Consumer Goods - 1999/00**

	Unit	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Beef	Kg	2,000	2,000	1,500	1,700	1,800
Chicken	No.	3,900	3,000	2,500	3,000	3,100
Cooking oil	3 Litres	1,400	1,800	1,200	1,800	1,500
Sugar	Kg	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Salt	½kg	300	200	200	250	250
Local bull	No.	146,000	204,000	118,000	200,000	170,000
Local cow	No.	157,000	167,000	99,000	182,000	154,000
Local calf	No.	72,000	90,000	66,000	102,000	84,000
Goat	No.	18,500	23,000	12,300	26,000	20,000
Pig	No.	26,000	28,000	14,000	31,000	25,000
Sheep	No.	10,000	17,000	12,000	18,800	15,000
Soap	No.	800	800	800	800	800

*Values have been adjusted to the nearest 100 shillings*

## 1.8 Migration Characteristics

**Migration highest in the North**

The migration trends and the reasons for migration that were prevalent in the communities are presented in Table 1.12. It can be observed that in the central region 74 percent of the communities reported in-migration greater than out-migration while in all the other regions, less than 50 percent of the communities reported so. In western region, 31 percent of the communities reported out-migration being greater than in-migration.

**Table 1.12: Type of Migration (%) – 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
In-migration larger than out-migration	74	47	37	40	52
Out-migration larger than in-migration	8	10	17	31	16
Equal in and out	11	20	9	4	11
Very little migration	7	24	37	25	20

### 1.8.1 Reasons for Migration

**Economic reasons are the major cause of migration**

Table 1.13 shows that the most important reason for in and out-migration was due to economic reasons. Seventy-one percent of all surveyed communities reported that seeking better economic opportunities was the major cause of in-migration. More communities in the central (83 percent) and western regions (80 percent) reported the same reason for in-migration. Civil strife was reported as the major cause of migration in the northern region.

**Table 1.13: Reason for Migration (%) – 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
<b>Reason for In-Migration</b>					
Economic Opportunity	83	53	43	80	71
Civil Conflicts	1	4	40	6	7
Others	17	43	18	14	23
<b>Reason for Out-Migration</b>					
Economic Opportunity	56	69	21	53	51
Civil Conflicts	3	3	31	0	7
Others	42	29	48	47	42

## 1.9 Access to Social Infrastructure

Access to social infrastructure, like rural feeder roads, allows farmers to access markets and command a better price for their produce. It also allows them to access the latest technical advancements that may help them improve the profitability of their farms. Access to infrastructure may also increase the community's access to social capital.

In this regard, information on distances from the communities to the road networks, the various communication modes and basic social services were obtained from communities. Table 1.14 highlights some of the findings.

**Tarmac roads are on average 22 km from the communities**

On average, tarred (tarmac) roads were still far from the communities. The average distance to a tarmac road was 22 kilometres. The distance was longer in rural areas (24 km) compared to urban areas (2 km). However, there has been some improvement as compared to 1997.

Taxis/*matatu* are more easily accessed than buses. The average distance to taxis was reported as 6 km compared to 12 km for buses. As expected, rural areas reported longer distances as compared to urban for both means of transport. The average distance to taxis improved from 9 km in 1997 to 6 km in 1999/00.

**Table 1.14: Average Distance to Infrastructure Facilities**

	1997			1999/00		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Tarred (tarmac) roads	34	4	32	24	2	22
Murram roads	5	1	5	4	1	4
All season feeder roads	2	1	2	2	0	2
Transport (Buses)	14	4	13	13	4	12
Transport (Taxis/ <i>matatu</i> )	9	2	9	7	1	6
Trucks/ Pick-Ups	12	2	12	13	1	12
Private Motor vehicles	13	2	12	13	1	12
Nearest Post Office	18	3	16	19	3	17
Telephone call box/booth	-	-	-	24	3	22
Nearest Bank	36	4	33	31	5	29
Factory employing at least 10 people	-	-	-	24	4	21

At regional level, communities in the northern region reported that the average distance to tarmac roads was 36 km as compared to 10 km in central region. The information is depicted in Table 1.15. All season feeder roads were accessible to most of the communities. Factories employing 10 persons and above were more widely distributed in the central region with an average distance of 8 km as compared to that of 31 km in the northern region.

**Table 1.15: Average Distance to Infrastructure Facilities (1999/00)**

	Central	Easter	Northern	Western
Tarred (tarmac) roads	10	23	36	22
Murram roads	4	4	8	4
All season feeder roads	1	2	3	2
Transport (Buses)	10	14	15	12
Transport (Taxis/ <i>matatu</i> )	4	6	8	6
Trucks/ Pick-Ups	7	13	23	8
Private Motor vehicles	6	14	29	8
Nearest Post Office	11	14	32	16
Telephone call box/booth	13	21	42	21
Nearest Bank	20	28	40	29
Factory employing at least 10 people	8	26	31	27

## 1.10 Access to Credit Facilities

### Introduction:

Given the large proportion of small-holder agricultural farmers, access to credit would help improve the productivity and have a fair share of the marketable produce of such farmers. The Uganda Poverty Status Report, 1999 mentions that increasing the access of the rural poor to credit services is one way of reducing poverty. The priority is therefore to promote the growth of Micro-financial Institutions and Rural Village Banks. The data should be treated with caution because it merely notes the availability of such credit services and does not investigate the extent of the usage of these services.

### 1.10.1 Sources of credit

#### *Entandikwa* was a considerable source of credit

The data in Table 1.12 shows that relatives/friends and the *Entandikwa* credit scheme by government were the major sources of credit. Twenty-five percent of the communities reported the existence of the Government funded *Entandikwa* credit scheme. There has been a considerable decline in the availability of *Entandikwa* credit scheme from 45 percent in 1997 to 25 percent in 1999/00.

Informal borrowing from relatives/friends was the major source of credit and is relatively widespread as shown in Table 1.16. The extent of this borrowing remained the same between the reference periods.

About 20 percent of the communities reported the availability of credit facilities to members from banks. The proportion is higher in urban areas whereby almost half of the communities reported the availability of credit from banks compared to 14 percent in rural areas. There was a marginal increase of only 3 percentage points between 1997 and 1999/00.

Money lenders and registered co-operatives play a very small role in the provision of credit facilities.

**Table 1.16: Availability Credit Facilities**

	1997			1999/00		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	Percent					
Bank	11	42	14	14	49	17
Registered Co-operatives	6	16	7	7	14	8
<i>Entandikwa</i>	43	61	45	25	25	25
Local Co-operatives	21	25	21	13	18	13
Relatives/Friends	48	38	47	46	56	47
Money lenders	2	2	2	2	6	2
Others	3	7	4	16	24	17

The distribution of credit availability by region is depicted in Table 1.17. Forty-one percent of the communities in the western region reported *Entandikwa* as sources of credit the highest in all regions, followed by eastern region.

The data also shows that informal borrowing from relatives and friends is relatively widespread especially in the western region. While forty-one percent of communities in the central region reported having access to credit from banks, in the northern region there is virtually no access to loans from banks.

**Table 1.17: Communities Reporting the Existence of Credit (%) – 1999/00**

Facility	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
Bank	41	11	0*	13	18
Registered Co-operatives	8	8	4	9	8
<i>Entandikwa</i>	21	25	10	41	25
Local Co-operatives	13	9	3	24	13
Relatives/Friends	48	37	35	64	47
Money lenders	1	3	0	6	2
Others	32	44	2	4	17

0\* Percentage is so small that it rounds off to 0

### 1.10.2 Security Requirements

**Land and assets are necessary to access formal credit**

Table 1.18 shows that where security was a requirement for obtaining credit, land and other assets were the usual security requirement. This was evident in all the regions except in the northern whereby only 37 percent of the communities reported this type security as a prerequisite for loan acquisition from banks. The extent of informal social contacts was demonstrated by the fact that security is not required from three-quarters of the loans sought from relatives and friends.

**Table 1.18: Communities reporting the Security requirement by region.**

Facility	Bank	Regd. Coop.	Entandikwa	Local Coop.	Relatives /Friends	Money lenders	Others
<b>Central</b>							
Percentage							
No requirement	3	10	29	34	52	12	8
Land and other assets	95	75	41	53	25	87	41
Responsible person	2	15	30	14	13	1	39
<b>Eastern</b>							
No requirement	7	54	28	41	68	24	67
Land and other assets	89	32	55	18	28	66	29
Responsible person	4	14	15	23	1	11	4
<b>Northern</b>							
No requirement	63	53	75	71	96	.	62
Land and other assets	37	.	25	11	1	.	30
Responsible person	.	47	.	18	.	.	4
<b>Western</b>							
No requirement	.	16	79	6	86	5	11
Land and other assets	100	44	12	56	9	93	61
Responsible person	.	31	10	39	5	2	29
<b>Uganda</b>							
No requirement	3	28	56	22	75	10	45
Land and other assets	95	46	29	47	16	86	36
Responsible person	2	24	15	28	6	4	16

### 1.10.3 Access to Credit by Women

There is some status discrimination in the provision of credit

Table 1.19 shows that there is general access to credit by women. While other sources do not generally discriminate while providing loans to women, to a certain extent money lenders restrict their lending to women who have assets or household heads. This practice by the money lenders was more widespread in the central and eastern regions. Banks also to a limited extent restrict lending to women with assets.

**Table 1.19: Access to Credit by Women**

Facility	Central		Eastern		Northern		Western		Uganda	
	All women	Only women with assets								
Bank	71	25	64	26	.	37	92	6	<b>74</b>	<b>21</b>
Reg. Coop.	87	12	42	31	33	.	84	8	<b>69</b>	<b>14</b>
Entandikwa	86	9	38	41	86	6	95	5	<b>78</b>	<b>14</b>
Local Coop.	85	11	52	20	50	11	78	8	<b>74</b>	<b>10</b>
Relatives/Friends	89	4	64	26	94	.	91	2	<b>86</b>	<b>7</b>
Money lenders	20	80	21	76	.	.	53	40	<b>42</b>	<b>53</b>
Others	93	4	64	2	34	.	48	47	<b>68</b>	<b>8</b>

## 1.11 Agricultural Characteristics in Rural Areas

### 1.11.1 Availability of Agricultural Land

Table 1.20 shows agricultural land for rent and for sale that is available in a number of communities. The proportion of communities with agricultural land for sale and rent increased between 1997 and 1999/00.

**Table 1.20: Land Availability**

	1997			1999/00		
	Available	Not Available	Other	Available	Not Available	Other
	Percent					
Allocated for cultivation	15	58	27	22	61	17
Agricultural land for sale	36	38	26	53	35	12
Agricultural land for rent	61	27	12	65	21	14

### 1.11.2 Type of Land Tenure

Leasehold is the least common type of land tenure

The most common type of land tenure reported was unregistered free mailo (*Kibanja*). Over half of the communities in the country have this type of land tenure as seen in Table 1.21. Customary land was the second most common type of land tenure with about 40 percent of the communities reporting this type.

Regionally, 84 percent of the communities in central region and over half in eastern and western regions had unregistered free mailo as the most common type of land tenure, whereas the northern region had none. On the other hand, almost all communities in the northern region had customary land. Eastern and western regions each had about one-third of the communities with customary land, while central region had less than 5 percents communities with customary land.

**Table 1.21: Type of land tenure**

Type of land tenure	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Percentage				
Registered free mailo	2	1	1	4	<b>2</b>
Unregistered free mailo (Kibanja)	84	63	0	61	<b>53</b>
Lease hold	0*	0*	0	1	<b>0*</b>
Customary	4	32	98	34	<b>41</b>
Public	2	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
Squatters	6	2	1	0	<b>2</b>
Others	2	1	0	0	<b>1</b>

*0\* Figures very small and rounds to zero*

### 1.11.3 Use of improved seeds for staple food crops

#### Very limited use of improved seeds

The proportion of farmers using improved seeds for staple food crops in communities is shown in Table 1.22. Overall, 45 percent of the crop farmers in communities do not use improved seeds for staple food crops. Almost the same proportion of farmers (46 percent) in the communities had few farmers who use improved seeds for staple food crops.

The use of improved seeds for staple food crops was more applied in eastern region and least applied in the northern region.

**Table 1.22: Proportion of Communities Where Farmers Used Improved Seeds – 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Percentage				
All	0	0	1	2	<b>1</b>
Many	2	13	2	3	<b>5</b>
About half	4	5	2	2	<b>3</b>
Few	62	46	30	44	<b>46</b>
None	32	36	65	49	<b>45</b>

### 1.11.4 Use of Ox-ploughs

The proportion of communities that had all farmers using ox-ploughs is only 4 percent as seen in Table 1.23. Almost two-thirds of LC 1's had none

of the farmers who used ox-ploughs. About 20 percent of the LC 1's had few farmers who used ox-ploughs.

### Ox-ploughs mostly used in the East and North

In eastern and northern regions, there was extensive use of ox-ploughs. The proportion of LC 1's that had all farmers who used ox-ploughs was 7 percent, while Northern region had 10 percent. Central and western regions had virtually no ox-ploughs usage.

**Table 1.23: Proportion of Communities Where Farmers Used Ox-ploughs, 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Percentage				
All	0	7	10	0	<b>4</b>
Many	0	15	2	0*	<b>4</b>
About half	0	9	1	0*	<b>2</b>
Few	1	30	40	2	<b>17</b>
None	99	39	47	98	<b>73</b>

0\* Percentage is so small that it rounds off to 0

### 1.11.5 Use of tractors for cultivation

### Tractors used by very small proportion of communities

Overall, the proportion of communities where all the farmers used tractors for cultivation was less than 1 percent, as seen in Table 1.24. This seem to indicate that tractors are not affordable. The proportion of LC 1's whose farmers used tractors for cultivation was only 9 percent. This implies that the proportion of LC 1's that had none of the farmers that used tractors for cultivation was over 90 percent. This pattern was similar in all regions.

**Table 1.24: Proportion of Communities Where Farmers Used Tractors – 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Percentage				
All	0	0	0	1	<b>0*</b>
Many	0	1	0*	0*	<b>0*</b>
About half	0*	0*	0	0*	<b>0*</b>
Few	16	16	3	3	<b>9</b>
None	84	83	97	96	<b>91</b>

0\* Percentage is so small that it rounds off to 0

### 1.11.6 Farmers Visited by Agricultural extension Workers

**Agricultural extension workers do not reach majority of farmers**

Agriculture extension workers help farmers by updating them with modern farming skills. The proportion of LC 1's that had all farmers visited by extension agents was only 2 percent as seen in Table 1.25. The proportion of LC 1's that had none of the farmers visited by extension agents was above 60 percent.

Western region had over 5 percent of all the farmers in the LC 1's visited by agricultural extension workers while eastern had only 1 percent. Northern region had the highest proportion of LC 1's that had none of the farmers visited by agricultural extension workers.

**Table 1.25: Proportion of Farmers Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Percentage				
All	0	1	0	6	<b>2</b>
Many	3	7	1	13	<b>7</b>
About half	3	2	1	3	<b>2</b>
Few	32	37	15	23	<b>27</b>
None	62	53	83	55	<b>62</b>

### 1.11.7 Wage rates

**Wage rates better for non-agricultural workers**

Males engaged in agricultural and non-agricultural activities had a higher daily wage than the female counterparts in almost all regions. Overall, daily wage rates offered for non-agricultural workers were better than those for agricultural workers in all regions. The central region offered higher wages for both agricultural and non-agricultural activities whereas northern region offered the lowest.

**Table 1.26: Wage rates per day**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	Uganda
	Value				
Agricultural wages per person per day (men)	1,630	920	550	1,020	<b>1,030</b>
Agricultural wages per person per day (women)	1,420	860	550	940	<b>940</b>
Non-agricultural wages per person per day (men)	1,640	1,230	820	1,200	<b>1,280</b>
Non-agricultural wages per person per day (women)	1,230	1,130	540	1,070	<b>1,020</b>

## 2 Education and health infrastructure

### 2.1 Education

Information was collected on education infrastructure from the communities. Emphasis was put on issues related to primary level education. Some of the information was collected from the school authorities, usually the head-teachers, and some of it from the village elders. Basic Primary School characteristics were also collected.

#### Facilities of urban schools were better than that of rural areas

Table 2.1 shows that the average distance to a primary school was only 0.6 km in the urban areas while it is 1.5 km in the rural areas. This means that access was much easier in the urban areas.

On ownership, about 85 percent of all primary schools were government aided. The community or parents owned a very small proportion of the schools. Furthermore, about 95 percent of the primary schools were for both sexes, with only 5 percent being single-sex primary schools.

There were disparities in the costs of schooling, with the average annual official fee for children in the highest grade in urban schools being considerably higher than that in rural areas.

Academic performance was considerably higher in urban areas. The average number of students who passed primary seven was 58 in urban areas compared to 22 in rural areas. Furthermore, schools in urban areas had more teachers with formal teaching qualifications than rural schools.

**Table2.1: Basic Characteristics of Primary Schools by Area of Residence - 1999/00**

	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average distance to school (km)	1.5	0.6	1.4
<b>Percentage of Communities with:</b>			
No primary school	55	59	55
One primary school	35	25	34
Two primary schools	7	13	8
More than 2 Primary Schools	4	3	3
<b>Ownership of Primary Schools</b>			
Government	88	64	85
Religious groups	3	6	3
Parents/community	2	0*	2
Percentage of schools for both sexes	95	99	96
Percentage of schools for boys only	1.8	0.7	1.7
Percentage of schools for girls only	0.8	0.4	0.7
Average no of shifts	1	1	1
Average official fee per year	2,800	67,700	12,000
Average Expense for text books	4,400	3,700	4,200
Average No. of students per school	712	689	709
Average No of students who sat P7	30	60	35
Average No of students who passed P7	22	58	27
Average No of students in the highest grade	39	76	44
Average No of qualified teachers	10	16	11
Average No. of unqualified teachers	3	1	2

Table 2.2 shows the regional distribution of educational characteristics. Government ownership of primary schools was more prevalent in the northern region (97 percent) and least in the central region (65 percent). Schools in eastern and northern regions are more likely to have more students per school than those in central and western regions.

On average, schools in the western region have fewer teachers with formal education than schools in other regions. Central region had the highest average official fees per child per year, where the average official fees per child per year were almost ten times higher than that of other regions.

**Table 2.2: Basic Characteristics Relating to Primary Schools - 1999/00**

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western
Average distance to school (km)	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4
No primary school	56	62	50	53
One primary school	31	33	28	41
Two primary school	11	4	11	4
More than 2 primary schools	2	1	11	1
Government aided schools	65	92	97	92
Religious groups	6	1	1	4
Parents/community	4	1	1	1
Charitable institution	1	.	0	.
For both sexes	96	97	92	97
Boys only school	1	2	4	0
Girls only school	0	0	3	0
Average no of shifts	1	1	1	1
Average official fee	35,000	3,740	1,645	1,700
Average expense for text books	2,400	4,000	152	9,000
Average No of students	500	800	800	600
Average No. of students sat P7	40	39	29	30
Average No. of students who passed P7	35	31	21	20
Average No. of students in highest grade	52	49	35	38
Average No. of qualified teachers	11	13	10	9
Average No. of unqualified teachers	4	2	2	2

## 2.2 Health Characteristics

Information was collected from knowledgeable medical personnel operating health facilities that included hospitals, health centres, clinics and pharmacies in the surveyed communities. The survey addressed health units selling medicine as well as those having qualified doctors and other medical attendants provided they offered treatment to patients including dressing and emergency attention.

### Basic medical necessities readily available

Nationally, the average distance to the health facility was 5 km as shown in Table 2.3. Disparities were noticed between the rural and urban areas, where the average distance to the health facility was only 2 km in urban areas and 6 km in the rural areas. The average consultation fee in the urban areas was thrice that in the rural areas.

A good proportion of the health facilities surveyed had most of the basic medical necessities like malaria drugs, antibiotics, and immunization vaccines. There is however a lack of cooling equipment which is needed to preserve some vaccines. This deficiency is evident both in the rural and urban areas.

Health facilities with the capacity to admit patients are more in the urban areas (87 percent) than in the rural areas (almost 60 percent).

**Table2.3: Basic Characteristics of Health Clinics by Residence Area - 1999/2000**

	Rural	Urban	Total
Average distance to health facility (km)	6	2	5
Average fee for consultation	500	1,500	600
Average price for malaria	1,000	1,400	1,000
Average price for antibiotics	1,000	1,300	1,100
<b>Percentage of Clinics Reporting</b>			
Malaria drugs	90	93	90
Antibiotics	86	92	87
Oral re-hydration packages	87	93	87
Equipments to sterilise needles	81	90	82
Supply of bandages	72	88	74
Supply of sterile needles & syringes	86	92	86
Immunization vaccines	81	91	82
Cooling storage, without back supply	50	59	50
Lack of Cooling storage	50	41	50
Clinics admitting in-door patients	59	87	62

### 3: Conclusion

The data shows a general improvement in the community characteristics between 1997 and 1999/00. The average distance to primary schools was about 1.5 km. Government continues to have a very strong presence in the provision of education services with about 85 percent of the communities reporting government aided schools. Access to schools is still limited with about 55 percent of the communities that were surveyed in the country reporting that they do not have a primary school within the community. Only 34 percent of the communities had one primary school.

Data on provision of credit shows that assets, especially land, are required as a prerequisite to accessing loans, and that informal borrowing from relatives and friends serve as important sources of loans. Government funded *Entandikwa* Credit scheme continues to be a source of loans to the rural residents.

The role of money lenders as sources of loans is very small. There is little restriction to credit to women by most potential sources of credit. The findings on the credit section are largely consistent with findings from the socio-economic survey on issues like the source of credit and security requirements.

Credit in the markets of agricultural inputs and agricultural produce markets is largely non-existent, and access to these markets is restricted. The data suggest that provision of credit in this area might improve farm out-put and productivity.

Agriculture is the mainstay of the Uganda economy. But the use of modern farming practises that are likely to improve yield and productivity is very low. In particular, the data shows that the use of mechanisation in form of

tractors and ploughs (except in the east and north), the use of improved seeds, and access to services to professional advice from agricultural extension agents is still very minute.

Where comparisons are made, the community survey data reveals improvements between 1997 and 1999/00. This is consistent with the socio-economic survey data. The data also shows regional disparities, with the central region being the relatively better off and the northern being worse off in most of the indicators. The survey also exhibited rural-urban disparities and the urban areas were better off in most of the measures.