



Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Project Beneficiary Assessment



Anthony Finn • Clare Jefferson • Santa Vusia • Deogratias Yiga

Copyright © 2012

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

1818 H Street, NW

Washington, DC 20433

www.tdrp.net

www.worldbank.org

This Study was produced under the Transitional Demobilization and Reintegration Program (TDRP). The findings, interpretations and conclusions herein are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect the views of the TDRP donors, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank and its affiliated organizations, its Executive Directors, or the governments they represent.

The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this publication is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission to reproduce portions of the work promptly.

Queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to:

the Office of the Publisher, The World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA

Fax: 202-522-2422. E-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org

Cover: Duina Reyes

Photos: TDRP/Burrall



Programme transitionnel de démobilisation et réintégration

Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Project Beneficiary Assessment

December 2011

*Anthony Finn
Clare Jefferson
Santa Vusia
Deogratias Yiga*

Contents

List of Acronyms	v
Introduction	1
1. Purpose of the study	1
2. Methodology	2
3. Limitations and challenges	3
1. Overview of the Analysis of Reporters and Community Reintegration	4
Unique challenges: female community members and female reporters	5
2. Demographic and Core Indicators.....	7
2.1 Marriage and marriage breakdown.....	8
2.2 Educational achievement and training	8
2.3 Land tenure, food security and conflict	9
2.4 Additional reintegration dimensions	11
2.4.1. Factional dimensions	11
2.4.2 Economic dimensions	11
2.4.3 Social dimensions	12
3. Economic Reintegration	13
3.1 Migration	14
3.2 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	15
3.2.1 Factional dimensions	15
3.2.2 Economic dimensions	15
4. Social and Political Reintegration	16
4.1 Social networks	16
4.2 Perceptions of community, trust and solidarity	16
4.3. Empowerment and social change.....	17
4.4 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	17
4.4.1 Factional dimensions	17
4.4.2 Political dimensions.....	17

5. DDR Process	18
5.1 Reinsertion payment: use, sensitization and expectations	19
5.2 Community experiences	20
5.3 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	20
5.3.1 Factional dimensions	20
5.3.2 Social dimensions	20
6. Conclusions.....	22
6.1 Economic reintegration	22
6.1.1 Community driven development.....	22
6.1.2 Rural-urban periphery	23
6.2 Social reintegration	23
6.2.1 Younger reporters	23
6.2.2 Female community members	23
Annexes	25

List of Tables

Table 1. Type of respondent by sample location (actual sample)	2
Table 2. Type of respondent by gender and age (actual sample)	3
Table 3. Marital status (combined)	9
Table 4. Reinsertion assistance: Time between SSD or formal demobilization and amnesty	18
Table 5. Receipt of reinsertion assistance (by armed group and year of receipt of amnesty).....	19

List of Acronyms

AC	Amnesty Commission
ADF	Allied Democratic Forces
AG	Armed Group
CFP	Community Focal Person
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
DRT	Demobilization and Resettlement Team
GoU	Government of Uganda
HHI	Household income
ICRS	Information, Counseling and Referral System
IGA	Income Generating Activity
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDRP	Multi-Donor Demobilization and Reintegration Program
NALU	National Army for the Liberation of Uganda
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NUDIPU	National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
PRA	People's Redemption Army
SSD	Spontaneous Self Demobilization
UgDRP	Uganda Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project
UPA	Ugandan People's Army
UPF	Ugandan Patriotic Front

UPDA	Ugandan Peoples Defense Army
UNRF	Ugandan National Rescue Front
WHO	World Health Organization
WNBF	West Nile Bank Front

Note on terminology

In this report the term “shifting” is used regarding reporter migration. This is because the local term was more familiar to the respondents in the sample and was the common term throughout the studies.

The term “spontaneous self demobilization” is used to denote the process whereby reporters left insurgency/ escaped captivity but did not demobilize as the result of an agreed process and did not receive amnesty.

The term “formal demobilization” is used to denote when reporters (WNBF and UNRF) demobilized en masse as a result of an agreement between the Amnesty Commission and the Government of Uganda.

“Amnesty” or “demobilization” is used to denote when reporters are given amnesty.

Introduction

The World Bank commissioned this survey of reporters and the communities within which they have settled as part of a batch of final studies and an evaluation at the end of the Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Program (UgDRP) in June 2011.¹

The analysis in this beneficiary assessment is complemented by what is presented in the companion studies, particularly: *The Drivers of reporter Reintegration in Northern Uganda (2011)*, *A Report into the Relationship between the Amnesty Commission and its Implementing Agents (2011)* as well as the *Final Independent Evaluation of the UgDRP 2008 – 2011 (2011)*, all of which were conducted concurrently in the second half of 2011.

1. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the beneficiary assessment was to document the demobilization, repatriation, reconciliation and reintegration experience of reporters and how their community perceived the dialogue, reconciliation and reporter reintegration processes. The survey and subsequent analysis examined the experiences in the following areas:

a. Demographics

Information pertaining to standard demographics plus levels achieved in education and training including vocational training, and aspirations in these areas.

b. Housing and security

Analysis of current situation, actual and perceived risks to safety and preliminary indicators of levels of trust in the community.

c. Land, livestock and food security

Analysis of access to land and general food security.

d. Reintegration experiences

For reporters and community members, an analysis of the levels of acceptance of reporters and reporter reintegration in the community and family, and the degree to which the community focal persons (CFPs) are effective. For reporters, an analysis of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) experiences and reintegration status. For the community members an analysis of views of the community on reintegration of reporters and pertinent dynamics such as acceptance, respect, stigma.

e. Economic issues

Analysis of current status, actual vulnerability and perceived vulnerability. Also, an analysis of perceived possibility of improvement or worsening of economic status. Sub-headings for analysis include: income, savings and credit and economic associations. Specific focus on economic issues stratified by gender, disability and non-economically active reporters.

f. Migration

Analysis of shifts by respondents including frequency and drivers and how they relate to conflict, reconciliation and reintegration.

g. Social capital

Analysis of social capital dynamics and indicators including: trust and solidarity; collective action and cooperation; social cohesion; empowerment, and so-

¹ Implemented between August 2008 and June 2011, the UgDRP was established to build upon previous support to the Amnesty Commission through the MDRP to assist in the DDR of 14,545 reporters at a cost of USD 4.2 million. The UgDRP was originally planned to be worth USD 8.254 million for the purpose of bringing an end to the protracted conflict in northern Uganda. In 2008 a multi-donor trust fund managed by the World Bank was established to implement the program.

cial change. The analysis triangulates actual indicators with perceptions of the effect of conflict, reconciliation and reintegration on same.

2. Methodology

The overall methodology consisted of four dynamics:

- a) Document review (Phase One);
- b) Quantitative sampling and survey (Phase Two);
- c) Qualitative survey (Phase Three);
- d) Analysis (Phase Four).

At inception the parameters for the sampling were 394 reporters and 180 community members. The sample of reporters was proportionally divided by demobilization and resettlement team (DRT) in line with the percentage of reporter population received through each DRT². Community members sampled follows the same percentage distribution. The second parameter applied to the sample was similarity in gender between reporter and community samples. The third was similarity in age and the fourth was similarity in location. The fifth parameter was that reporters must have been demobilized between August 2008 and June 2011; that is, during the lifetime of the UgDRP.³ As the Information, Counseling and Referral Services (ICRS) returns data on the year of demobilization and not the month, the sample was widened slightly to anyone received between 2008 and 2011.

The survey sample was drawn in two parts: (i) able-bodied reporters disaggregated primarily by gender and age; (ii) disabled reporters, primarily disaggregated by gender and age. The disabled sample was broken down proportionally by DRT and by gender. The community member survey of 180 was divided as follows: 120 who have parity based on gender and age with the reporter sample and 60 randomly sampled and including disabled community members, older and younger community members without applying other prescriptive criteria. Reporter samples were drawn to include two supplementary lists from which field teams randomly selected reporters when those on the primary list were not contactable. During field work some working adjustments were made to the sample as challenges arose, but these adjustments did not affect the consistency of the overall sample.

It was determined that 10% of the sample should com-

prise disabled reporters. In the ICRS, the Amnesty Commission sorts the disability field by (i) amputees; (ii) blind and partially blind; (iii) paralysis and partial paralysis; (iv) body and head injury; (v) other. The “other” field included minor injuries and ailments, so to calculate the percentage of total reporters, this category was omitted giving just over 9% of disabled reporters.

At the close of fieldwork the *actual* sample was: 410 reporter surveys (69.3% of overall total) and 182 community surveys (30.7% of overall total). The sample point and gender distribution is shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Type of respondent by sample location (actual sample)

Sample location	Reporter	Community
Kampala	14	0
Arua	162	54
Gulu	21	42
Central	8	12
Kasese	21	12
Kitgum	146	49
Mbale	38	13
Total	410	182

2 The Amnesty Act established the Amnesty Commission and identified that among other monitoring and coordination functions the AC will “monitor programs of (i) demobilization; (ii) reintegration; and (iii) resettlement of reporters”. A seven member DRT established by the Act and under the supervision of the AC was constituted to “draw programs for: (a) de-commissioning of arms; (b) demobilization; (c) re-settlement; and (d) reintegration of reporters. The AC, through the DRTs, has maintained six offices as follows: Central, Gulu, Kitgum, Mbale, Arua, Kasese and a liaison office in Beni in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

3 The AC was executing some of its activities under a memorandum of understanding with IOM (with UNDP funding) for the most part of 2008 until end of December 2008.

Table 2. Type of respondent by gender and age (actual sample)⁴

	Reporter			Community		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
18-30 years	109	48	157	51	33	84
31-40 years	86	14	100	29	11	40
Over 40 years	108	42	150	44	12	56
Total	303	104	407	124	56	180

3. Limitations and challenges

a. Data

There were challenges with data in the AC’s ICRS and particularly data drawn for the sample, which delayed the field work. Time was spent to manually clean up the data to arrive at the sample. Thus negative effects of this limitation were managed.

b. Issues pertaining to identification, location and participation of reporters

Reporter migration made it difficult to locate some of them. The survey team imposed a 100% margin of error on samples, created two substitute lists of reporters for the AC, and utilized CFPs, old command structures and where relevant, associations such as NUDIPU to help identify and locate appropriate respondents. Also, the timing of the survey coincided with the beginning of the rainy season. Given that many reporters are occupied with agriculture and

considering the changing weather patterns, they were engaged in attending to their crops. However, through the measures outlined above the negative effects of this limitation were managed.

c. Disabled sub-groups: comparative analysis between community and reporters

In the analysis, it was not possible to compare disabled reporters to disabled community members. This is because despite using local networks, authorities and bodies such as the NUDIPU, only nine disabled community members were sampled compared to 70 disabled reporters. However, disabled people from each sample can be compared to the rest of that sample, meaning that disabled reporters can be compared to able-bodied reporters and disabled community members to able-bodied community members.

⁴ Some respondents did not provide their age, which explains the difference in total numbers between tables 1 and 2.

1. Overview of the Analysis of Reporters and Community Reintegration

Reporters and civilians in Uganda are successfully reintegrated. This outcome is central to the efficacy of complex multi-dimensional peace and stability interventions in Uganda and is a foundation upon which effective development programming can be implemented in the future. In DDR programming the lens of four dimensions of reintegration (factional, political, economic, and social) can be applied to assess whether or not there has been successful demobilization and reintegration.

- The factional dimension requires that command structures have been broken down. The degree to which this has occurred is measured through the extent to which reporters have broken social ties to their commanders and co-fighters and by examining the nature of those ties.
- The political dimension requires that reporters have acquired faith in democracy and in the democratic structures of the state. The degree to which political reintegration has occurred is measured through the extent to which reporters resort to democratic or civil means for resolving disputes and the degree to which they have faith in the workings of the state in principle.
- The economic dimension requires that reporters can successfully generate income or a livelihood through legitimate means. The degree to which economic reintegration has occurred is measured in depth through the extent to which reporters can engage in le-

gitimate economic activities and their level of income and food security.

- The social dimension requires that reporters and community are reconciled. The degree to which it has occurred is measured through an analysis of the acceptance of reporters and an in depth analysis of aspects of social inclusion and social capital.

The *degree of success* of all four dimensions is measured through the comparative analysis of demographic, factional, political, economic and social indicators of reporters and community members. The findings of the study that there is successful reintegration of reporters and civilians is not just a broad programmatic achievement; rather it is also testimony to the resilience, receptiveness, and inclusiveness of communities and families and the fortitude and persistence of reporters to integrate on their return.

The reintegration of reporters and communities has had considerable successes but still faces some challenges. A core success is the good social reintegration of reporters and community that can be observed across a wide spectrum of indicators ranging from social inclusion to stigma, from social capital to acceptance and empowerment. A key challenge is that overall reporters still lag behind the community in economic wealth and activity however, this is not equal with concluding that economic reintegration has not occurred.

The study methodology of surveying reporters and community members has allowed some at risk sub-

groups to be identified and profiled within both reporter and community samples. Within the reporter sample, the vulnerable sub-groups are female reporters. When cross-tabulated across armed groups, the vulnerable sub-groups are LRA female reporters and youth. Within the community sample, the vulnerable sub-group is female community members.

The cross analysis of female reporters and female community members reveals important dynamics of vulnerability and social exclusion. Female reporters, while vulnerable in the reporter group, have benefited significantly from reintegration activities, particularly education and training, to the extent that in many economic indicators they outperform their female counterparts in the community. Women in the community are a vulnerable sub-group and are constrained by familial structures and their roles in the family. They have a diverse set of livelihood strategies to address the everyday challenges of supporting their families that exceeds those of female reporters. Nevertheless they are constrained by education and training in a manner in which female reporters are not. The disparity in favor of female reporters over female community members is absent from the understanding of both the reporter and community sample. This makes the political, social and economic challenges faced by female community members unusual in this study: these challenges appear specific to them and go unrecognized by all other respondents in the survey.

The study also tracked the achievements of the 31-40 year old subgroup of reporters and community members, which includes individuals who ought to be most economically established and economically productive. By comparatively analyzing the achievements of this sub-group, it is clear that the principal challenge to reporters and community as outlined above (that overall reporters still lag behind the community in economic wealth and activity) is a symptom of the extent to which reporters are challenged with economically catching-up with the community after the lost years in rebellion. Reporters are consistently below community members concerning basic indicators of poverty and wealth (food security, housing, clothing, household finances) as captured in the self perception of reporters and community members when they measure their own placement between the poorest and most wealthy in society (annex 1 - table A33). On a nine step ladder where the first step represents

the poorest and the ninth the richest, reporters place themselves somewhere between step two and step three in all indicators. Community members place themselves between step three and four. Furthermore this reporter self perception accurately reflects the understanding of the community and reporters of where each other stand, and of the shared understanding of the challenges facing reporters as they work to make up the time lost and regain economic parity with the community.

The study is a snapshot of factional, political, economic and social reintegration. It is based on an understanding of reintegration as a dynamic process that continues after conflict, security and stabilization and into the wider development context. Consequently the process of reintegration persists longer than the DDR process and is not complete at the end of the DDR process. The reintegration in DDR concentrates on dealing with the immediate post-conflict security problem, i.e. potential instability when reporters are without economic opportunities on a level far worse than other community members. The reintegration process builds on disarmament and reinsertion, and supports reporters to become participants in society and in peace building, and as such is a foundation for building sustainable communities. This study documents how the reintegration challenges are a point of transformation where the marginalization and development issues of vulnerable sub-groups are most likely to be addressed by strong programs of income generating activities (IGA), livelihood, urban poverty and community driven development that are unilaterally available, but which target the vulnerable sub-groups in this study. As such 'reintegration' is transitioning from being part of a DDR process to being a development issue based principally on economic development and ensuring the social inclusion of marginal groups in the Ugandan society.

Unique challenges: female community members and female reporters

Throughout the study female reporters and female community members are consistently the more disadvantaged gender. The study finds that in comparison to male community members and across most demographic, social and economic indicators, female community members seriously underperform and are more at risk of isolation and social exclusion. The

study also finds that female reporters fare similarly when compared to male reporters. When comparing female community members to female reporters however, female reporters often outperform female community members in some key development areas (i) land ownership; (ii) vocational training; (iii) household finances including breaking-even at the end of each month, and (iv) social networks. A major conclusion is that female reporters have been effectively targeted by vocational training since demobilization and that they are more skilled than their female community counterparts (see Section 5). Both healthy and disabled female reporters aged 18- 30 years are receiving skills training more than any other gender-age cohort, including all males. Female reporters in this category show the highest level of training and outperform their community counterparts.

Regarding land ownership, just under half of female reporters identify that they have a title deed or proof of ownership for their own land compared to one third of female community members. Regarding food security, female reporters are more prone to hunger than their counterparts in the community; however they do not represent a large proportion of the total group.⁵ In literacy, female community members outstrip female reporters: fully literate female community members are twice the proportion of female reporters. However, as noted above female reporters are far more skilled than their equivalent female community members. This is reflected in how female community members consider education or lack of skills as their main barrier to reintegration whereas half as many female reporters identify this barrier. Female reporters are more concerned by health and access to credit. Re-

garding personal credit and savings nearly all female community members belong to savings associations compared to just over half of female reporters.

As is seen throughout the study, female community members are more likely to be the functional household head than female reporters with responsibility for feeding the household. They engage in credit and savings as essential strategies to ensure that family needs are met. However, this indicates the degree to which female community members are combining frequent borrowing and saving to maintain the lowest level of food and income security in the sample. In household finances female community members are far less likely to break even than female reporters. If a small proportion of female reporters has money left at the end of the month, no female community members do. This builds a picture of female community members' relative disadvantage to male community members and their financial disadvantage to female reporters.

Women in the community participate less in formal gatherings than males. They are more isolated and more at risk in terms of personal security, and so more conscious of safety and security issues than males. Despite having similar social network challenges to female community members, female reporter are likely to be more secure socially, economically and in how they perceive the security of the external environment.

5 See also Section 2.3

2. Demographic and Core Indicators

Demographics captured in the study are: (i) gender; (ii) age; (iii) disability; (iv) health; (v) marriage and separation/divorce; (vi) household composition including functional head, and (v) educational achievement and training. Additional demographic information pertaining to: (i) membership of armed group; (ii) personal history of rebellion, and (iii) demobilization are gathered for reporters.

Conflict produces social disintegration including the fragmentation of family, communities and the broader society. A prerequisite of post-conflict recovery and a stated goal of the Ugandan DDR process since the creation of the Amnesty Act is social reintegration. As part of this, formerly fragmented networks must be made whole again and norms and processes resumed and cemented.

For reporters the challenges presented in the DDR process include re-entering fragmented units such as the family and the community, and over time being accepted there. They also include adopting and adhering to the accepted norms of the group and developing acceptance and social capital by being included in the accepted structures of the community (such as by being married and having a family). They involve contributing to the economic well-being of the community and not becoming dependent on social safety nets that have been severely compromised by the legacy of conflict.

In conflict, social disintegration affects all members of a community. Community members are forced to choose which faction they support and whether they will fight or not. Men often join the ranks of one fighting faction or another. This leads to the loss of fathers, husbands, and community leaders in many villages.

Upon joining a faction, individuals may break social ties, or they may be forced to break these ties through forced recruitment. The end result is the same: alienation from the community and the inability to look to the community for help or to rely on community safety nets. However, the complexity of the Ugandan conflict—in particular the huge number of rebel groups and the means through which people were enlisted—mean that reporters from different armed groups face different reintegration challenges and the severity of those challenges is varied. Older reporters from armed groups composed mainly of volunteers and reporters who spontaneously or formally demobilized in the past and were given amnesty between 2008 and 2011 face fewer challenges. More recently demobilized reporters, particularly those from the LRA, are particularly economically vulnerable and have faced more severe reintegration challenges with their families and relatives.

Through the re-establishment of community ties and the concomitant social and economic reintegration of reporters, the study's comparative analysis shows that reporters and community members largely share an understanding of the barriers that have been faced by reporters to contribute socially and economically to the community. There is a shared understanding that reporters are disadvantaged by educational and skills achievements and that such disadvantage can produce major barriers to full reintegration back into the community. There does not appear to be a general understanding that female reporters are more skilled or that they may face different reintegration barriers than male reporters. A very positive finding is that only a very small percentage of the community perceives reporters and their disadvantage as a resulting

risk of criminality. There appears to be an acceptance of reporters, and reporters and the community share similar economic and livelihood challenges. There is no evidence that reporters who were abducted were more likely to receive sympathy from the community; however the reporters from those armed groups which demobilized a long time ago and who had wider political support from the community tend to have reintegrated more successfully. Undoubtedly time is a driver of this reintegration but so is the historical communal support from the armed group, in particular UNRF.

2.1 Marriage and marriage breakdown

The aspects of the lives of reporters and community members discussed in this section are key indicators of reintegration and relate to the primary social units, networks and processes in society (marriage, the family, the household) as well as to the health and wellbeing of community members. This is useful not simply to get a profile of reporter and control groups (with the community/control group being useful in so far as it provides a baseline) but it also shows the stability or otherwise of these structures in society in their own right.

This aspect also points to how sub-groups in the community, particularly females, 18-30 year olds and older people, encounter barriers regarding these social units and how they navigate these barriers. The base indicators around health, marriage, family and education constitute the starting point for measuring integration, social inclusion and exclusion, security and insecurity (including food, physical, and psychosocial).

Marriage is an important step to rebuild community ties: it is the acquisition of the primary social unit, the basis of the family and in many cases the acquisition of wider immediate social safety nets in the form of the spouse's family. It is also a means to acquire land through regulated division⁶. For reporters, pathways to reintegration are available through the family, through gaining education and training, and through addressing health needs. This is also the case for communities.

There are definite gender and age dynamics which affect how female reporters experience barriers to reintegration and the frequency, particularly in ac-

cessing family networks through marriage. Female community members are significantly less likely to be married than male community members: female and male community members are more likely to be married than reporters.

Female community members, like their reporter counterparts, have far higher instances of divorce, separation and widowhood than the male cohorts. In the community divorce does not affect 18-30 year olds to any great degree. This compares favorably to the reporter survey where reporters in the 18-30 year old category have higher rates in all three surveyed forms of marriage breakdown. Older community members are far more likely to be divorced and less likely to be widowed compared to their reporter counterparts.

This displays that the community has a much higher instance of marriage and that those marriages are more stable. The community has less breakdown of this primary unit. For reporters there is a high frequency of marriage and partnership but it is less than in the community. Reporters have a higher marriage breakdown. While there is limited information about the causes of breakdown, the responses indicated that for just over one quarter of female reporters, marriage breakdown was due to specific trauma or issues directly related to the time spent in rebel groups compared to just under half of males. This indicates a possible risk of exclusion of female reporters. As is seen below, low educational attainment, low training and frequent personal finance problems, beleaguer female community members. The lack of marriage can exacerbate the survival strategies for those surveyed.

2.2 Educational achievement and training

Reporters and community are well integrated socially. They share a common understanding of the dynamics of their communities and the processes in which reporters must engage to catch up to other community members economically. This is evidenced by how both groups identify the following in similar proportions as key barriers to economic performance: (i) low literacy; (ii) inability to attain employment and look

⁶ Regulated division of land is division of land through formal practices such as inheritance or sale. Unregulated division refers to division of land that is not formalised by norms or legal frameworks such as land grabbing or forcible removal of access.

Table 3. Marital status (combined)

What is your current marital status?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Married monogamous	46.6%	16.5%	28.8%	55.0%	38.9%	31.4%	56.0%	28.1%	35.7%	67.5%	50.0%
Married polygamous	24.6%	14.6%	8.3%	25.0%	34.2%	11.4%	18.4%	8.8%	6.0%	15.0%	30.4%
Living together	5.6%	6.8%	9.0%	6.0%	2.7%	10.0%	1.6%	5.3%	3.6%	5.0%	.0%
Divorced	.3%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%	.7%	1.4%	.0%	7.0%	1.2%	.0%	5.4%
Separated	3.6%	14.6%	10.3%	3.0%	4.7%	10.0%	.8%	3.5%	.0%	2.5%	3.6%
Widowed	2.0%	27.2%	2.6%	5.0%	16.8%	20.0%	1.6%	10.5%	.0%	5.0%	10.7%
Single child - never married	1.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.2%	5.3%	7.1%	.0%	.0%
Single adult - never married	16.4%	19.4%	39.1%	5.0%	2.0%	15.7%	18.4%	31.6%	46.4%	5.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	305	103	156	100	149	70	125	57	84	40	56

after one's family and (iii) inability to participate in life and the community.

Community members have higher literacy rates than reporters both in reading and writing, and in read only or write only. Differences in literacy are increasingly striking across comparative groups: approximately one third of female reporters are fully literate in comparison to two thirds of female community members. Similarly approximately two thirds of male reporters are fully literate in comparison to most male community members. In an age group comparison, the most striking difference is between reporters in the 18-30 years bracket, where approximately half are literate in comparison to nearly all in the same age category in the community. As can be expected the current educational achievement level of comparative populations of reporter and community member reveals that a higher proportion of community members have a

higher standard of education. In Uganda, like other conflict situations, literacy is often established before the combatant takes up arms. However because of the abduction and young age of abductees in the Ugandan conflict, time spent in rebellion has also affected the literacy, educational achievement and training of reporters more than community members.

2.3 Land tenure, food security and conflict

Reporters have successfully achieved an equal level of land access, land ownership and property ownership to that of their fellow community members. Reporters and community members broadly share the same dwelling type; the same modes of land ownership and have similar levels of access to arable land and livestock.

Community households have access to land both in the community where they live and beyond their current dwelling place. Approximately half of the community members have access to land in another area. This land is likely acquired through the regulated division of land rather than unregulated. This means they are likely to have more secure livelihoods strategies, because if the land or crop or livestock fail in the area where they live, they have the other area as a safety net. The community ownership of land is more buoyant (has a greater propensity to change) than that of reporters who tend to display more unchanging land ownership patterns. However when examining those reporters and community members who have less land, the main reason is regulated division, usually when land is shared among a family. More community members than reporters have lost land through unregulated land division. Twice as many community members than reporters lost land because of abandoning it due to drought. The likelihood is that poverty in rural areas is severe, and when drought affects the land, a household may have no option but to abandon the land. Half as many community members lost land because of encroachment of urban development when compared to reporters, possibly a result of housing being built on reporter land while they were away in insurgency.

Reflecting the rural location of many respondents, the majority of reporters live in a hut with very few living in substandard structures such as sheeting. There are a variety of ownership models and nearly two thirds of reporters own their dwelling. There is a high level of ownership security including for female reporters. ADF reporters are the most vulnerable in terms of land ownership. Across comparable demographics in reporter and community samples, there are similarities regarding security of tenure. These similarities reveal that reporters and community members broadly share the same property type, issues and land ownership dynamics indicating that in terms of land security there is parity. Reporters and community members broadly share the same dwelling type, the same issue modes of land ownership, and have similar levels of access to arable land and livestock.

Where circumstances differ for reporters is in relation to the experience of hunger and nutritional deprivation. Despite similar levels of access to land, reporters are twice as likely to go hungry than community

members. It is likely that there is a gender dynamic to the reporter food insecurity as female reporters are far more likely to be food insecure than their counterparts in the community or than any other sub-group of reporters.

Regarding livestock, all groups in the community have more livestock than their reporter counterparts, but the acquisition and loss patterns are similar to those in reporter groups. There are similar ratios across community and reporter responses but older community members experience the biggest difference with their reporter counterparts.

Regarding food poverty, community members and reporters were surveyed around: (i) frequency queuing for free food; (ii) receipt of charitable food donations; (iii) hustling or begging, and (iv) rummaging in rubbish bins for food. Across all responses there were similarities between community and reporters. Female community members are likely to be part of a household with serious food poverty: 7.0% in households where someone *often* goes hungry and 63.2% in households where someone *seldom* goes hungry. This compares with 3.8% of female reporters in a household where someone *always* goes hungry, 32.7% in a household where someone *often* goes hungry and 41.3% in a household where someone *seldom* goes hungry.

Levels of hunger differ between reporter and community: reporters are twice as likely to go hungry often compared to community members. Similarly female reporters are far most prone to hunger than their counterparts in the community. This highlights the food insecurity of reporters and in particular households with female reporters. Based on this analysis it is evident that reporters and community members are well integrated in terms of land ownership and security. Reporters however, continue to exhibit greater food insecurity than their counterparts in the community.

Reporter and community members share a positive perception of security. They agree on key indicators of safety and the likelihood of a return to conflict. The study finds that 84.6% of reporters and 79.4% of community members confirm they never hear gunshots. Only 16.4% of reporters and 17.8% of community members identify that a return to conflict is likely. Conflicts that have arisen in communities were every-

day disagreements and quarrels, which are resolved without resorting to violence. However a small cohort of reporters (12.4%) and community members (7.7%) identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument, they would resort to physical violence. Female reporters are more likely to resort to violence (14.4%) as are 18-30 year old reporters (17.8%). These demographics correspond with the community sample where 8.8% of females and 10.7% of 18-30 year olds identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument they would resort to physical violence to resolve the conflict. Reporters have largely divested themselves of command structures and have very little contact with former commanders. They have replaced these structures with the support of family and a diverse body of friends. Because of this there are grounds for understanding that there is a positive outlook for peace and security in the communities studied.

Regarding the perception of war affectedness, there is a similarity between reporter and community samples: approximately half of reporters and community members identify that the area in which they currently live was more affected by the war than other areas. There is similarity between reporter and community perception of security: the same high proportion of nearly all community members and reporters identify their area as safe. Also, there is similarity across perceptions of the effect of having reporters residing in the area: approximately half of reporters and community state that having reporters in their areas increases the safety of the area. These perceptions are strong indicators of reintegration.

To compound the findings that reporters and community perceive a very low security threat, firearm penetration is also low with both groups having the same perception. Similarly large proportions of reporters and community identify that they never hear gunshots where they live. Proportionally reporters and community share similar perceptions about the likelihood of a return to violence.

2.4 Additional reintegration dimensions

2.4.1. Factional dimensions

Following the dissolution of former command structures, an analysis of attitudinal dynamics find that very similar percentages of reporters and community

members would hypothetically consider marrying a reporter: in other words for just over half of reporters and half of civilians there is no conflict or reporter-related barrier to marrying someone formerly from a rebel group.

However, both reporters and community members who indicated that they would not marry a reporter identified similar reasons: stigma, fear of reporters and the unknown character of individual reporters as a result of poor cultural or community linkages. Despite this, the percentage willing to inter-marry is a healthy indicator of inclusion.

In reality community members are far more likely to be married to a civilian than a reporter with the most striking comparative statistic being between female community members and female reporters: 88.5% of female community members are married to a civilian (compared to 87.5% of males) in comparison to 54.0% of female reporters. Similarly 7.7% of female community members are married to reporters (compared to 3.4% of males) in comparison to 42.0% of female reporters. What is unusual about this is how it relates to the wider social networks of reporters: reporters tend to have few reporter friends: over half of female reporters indicate this (see annexes 1 and 2, sections 4). So the question is: how do reporters have such a high reporter-to-reporter marriage ratio when their social networks are so much more diverse. There may be additional barriers to marriage that are not identified by this study. There is no data to identify whether reporters married while in an armed group or when leaving the armed group. However the response to the question about the use of the reinsertion payment shows that only four reporters used it to get married or towards the engagement.

2.4.2 Economic dimensions

Reporters are disproportionately subject to marriage breakdown. Marriage into a stable family unit with diverse social networks and family support networks is a step on the ladder to financial and economic sustainability and so marriage breakdown is a disintegration of those structures regardless of how established they may have been.

A barrier to economic reintegration is educational achievement and training. Reporter disadvantage in literacy and educational achievement is clear. The

overall impact of this on economic reintegration, livelihood and income generation does not appear now to be as significant as it might once have been (see Section 3). However, this is no guarantee that the impact won't be greater if the development context in many communities improves, particularly given how far 18-30 year old reporters are behind the community. The high illiteracy level of 31-40 year old reporters compared to the same group in the community also points to the current challenges in this group being economically productive and as advanced in terms of livelihoods and access to credit as their community counterparts – both key areas where they lag behind (see Section 3).

2.4.3 Social dimensions

Reporters and community members are reconciled since both would consider marrying a member of the other group. However, the reality is that marriage between reporters and civilians has a pattern whereby the significant majority of 18-30 year old communi-

ty members are not married. Similarly the majority of male reporters state they do not wish to marry a female reporter. Consequently female reporters are most likely to be married to a reporter.

Of those who are married, living together, divorced or separated (that is, not single) 43.3% of female reporters have at any one time been involved with a reporter compared to only 12.2% of male reporters. WNBF reporters do not get involved with other reporters. Only 6.9% of WNBF reporters had ever (past and present) been involved with a reporter, compared to the LRA at 26.4%, ADF at 37.5% and UNRF at 25%.

It is difficult to hypothesize about the reasons why female reporters are by far most likely to be married to a reporter and why it is so different to the experiences of male reporters. The outcome is however that female reporters are somewhat doubly disadvantaged by tending to be in exclusively reporter marriages and so more likely to be exposed to the social and economic risks associated with being a reporter.

3. Economic Reintegration

Sustainable economic reintegration is achievable through a complex strategy relying on similar structural successes and access points to social reintegration. Reporters return to communities in Uganda with limited skills and education as a consequence of time spent in conflict. The mix of spontaneous self-demobilization and formal demobilization complicates the situation for communities that need to economically as well as socially absorb reporters. Generally communities did not have a formal demobilization processes prior to return. As such they tended not to be prepared. In many communities the situation is further complicated by the low level of economic development and by the income and food security challenges faced by the community. In these conditions the return of reporters can worsen real or perceived vulnerability of local communities as those communities struggle to assist or accept them. It could be expected that this would exacerbate hostility or unwillingness of communities to accept back reporters.

Despite chronic development challenges, communities in Uganda are welcoming and accepting of reporters. They understand that reporters face added challenges to catch up with the community in terms of economic productivity, meeting household expenses and accessing credit. Reporters, because of their lack of skills, access to land, and because of their uncertain history can be perceived as a liability and can provoke a reaction of fear and hostility. However the study has found that this is not the case. Rather the return of reporters is characterized largely by understanding by the community and a sense of acceptance.

Community members are familiar with reporters: just under two thirds of the community sample have re-

porters in their immediate family, particularly 18-30 year olds community members. This should inform any understanding of levels of acceptance. When reporters began to be reinserted in the communities, just over half of the communities had fears relating to this return. Most common fears held by the community pertained to male reporters, although around a third of community members had fears of female and 18-30 year olds reporters. For many the fear was a general apprehension of the return of reporters. Those who could identify exactly what the fear was named a fear of social unrest or violent social activity. Today however only 3.3% of the community have any fears about reporters, showing how completely the risk of reporter return has been dispelled.

The community accurately understands the barriers experienced by reporters as they attempt to achieve economic productivity on par with fellow community members. Lack of qualifications for work is the most frequently cited barrier to employment by a similar percentage of reporters and community members. Two other barriers to employment are the lack of education and stigma. With regard to lack of employment, specific training is the main barrier identified by both groups that reporters must face. Regarding barriers to economic productivity, both the community and reporters identify that they experience the same barriers.

There are subtle differences between the two groups, with the community's lesser concern about capital, which indicates the difference between the two groups when accessing credit. The community has more established economic practices (and track records) compared to reporters. This is a symptom of reporters recovering from the lost economic opportunities as a

result of time spent in rebellion. However just under one third of reporters identify lack of financial support or capital as a threat compared to roughly half that proportion of the community. Also, the community is more worried about inflation than the reporters, which supports the idea that reporters are at an earlier economic stage and thus more affected by issues common to less established economic activities.

Opinions and perceptions held by the community and reporters largely correspond, which is a high level indicator of economic reintegration, at least perceptually. Measures of the actual economic profile of reporters and community, and comparative analysis of key indicators of economic productivity such as access to credit and household income thresholds add an additional depth to the analysis. Dynamics such as positions held in economic associations add nuance to the analysis of the stages of reintegration.⁷

There are very similar baselines for basic household expenditure and household income for reporters and community indicating strongly that the two are in very similar financial situations.

Regarding the generation of income, the trajectory of reporter employment since demobilization is positive, with more reporters employed now than at demobilization. When comparing the situation at the end of the conflict with the present, a similar proportion of community members were unemployed (approx 5-6%). One third of reporters were unemployed at demobilization compared to 9.2% now.⁸ The nature of reporter employment closely corresponds with that of the rest of the community, revealing little distinction in the sectors in which reporters are employed or studying and the percentage in each sector. What this indicates is that the labour market is not stratified in any significant way to either section off reporters from community or to have a negative bias against reporters.

More reporters believe their economic situation will improve in the future than not (approximately two thirds compared to one third). Young reporters and those of the LRA are the most positive about the future. Collectively reporter and community also broadly agree on the reasons for believing their personal economic situation will improve in the near future. Both groups emphasize: (i) improved agricultural productivity; (ii) improved productivity, working hard and saving, and (iii) improved or expanding business. Differences are minor, with reporters twice as likely to

identify government assistance as a reason for their optimism. They also profess a greater reliance on faith and hope that their child will get an education, job and support their parents in the future.

The main contrast in the economic activity of reporters and community is access to credit. Reporters have less access to micro-credit than community members: nearly half as many reporters have applied for credit from a financial institution as community members. Reporters are slightly less successful in their applications with approximately half of reporters being successful compared to nearly two thirds of community members. 18-30 year old reporters and 31 – 40 year old reporters are less successful than all others.

Reporters are also less involved in micro-economic activities than community members primarily because reestablishing the economic linkages that were disrupted by the conflict is more challenging for reporters than for community members. Approximately one third of reporters are engaged in micro-economic activities compared to over half of community members.

While largely economically reintegrated, reporters in general have greater challenges ensuring economic sustainability. This is because of the stage where many reporters are in their economic life. The study confirms that within reporter groups, female reporters are an at-risk group with less access to economic networks (and as will be seen, social networks). It confirms that reporters in the 31-40 year category have less established economic activities than those of the corresponding demographic group in the community. They face challenges associated with their stage of business or economic activity. This is evidence of the gradual recovery from lost years in rebellion.

3.1 Migration

Migration patterns and the triggers for migration of both reporter and community are similar, demonstrating that perceived discrimination is not an influential trigger for reporter migration.

⁷ See section 6.1, annex 1 section 3.6 and annex 2 section 3.5

⁸ “Demobilization” refers to demobilization stage (i.e. during the receipt of amnesty) and not the time of formal demobilization, for example, when the WNBf demobilized en masse after a negotiated settlement in 1997.

Few reporters have migrated however the percentage that has is nearly double that of community members (18.0% compared to 11.5%). The major statistic regarding the frequency of migration concerns those who have migrated once: 71.6% of reporters (78.6% of female reporters and 67.4% of males), compared to 76.2% of community (85.7% females and 71.4% of males). There is no evidence of community members migrating multiple times but 14.9% of reporters have migrated twice.

Migration patterns of reporters and community members are similar but the distribution of population to various kinds of locations at the end of the conflict (identified in the study as the first step or location before migration) is somewhat different. Comparing the points of origin (place lived at the end of the conflict), it is evident that reporter net migration is limited. The main change is a move to peri-urban settlements and Kampala. For community members, the migration to urban centers has been largely balanced by migration to rural settlements. So overall there is limited net differentiation between the movements of the two groups revealing that there is nothing abnormal driving reporters to migrate.

The main drivers of migration are economic or pertain to the social networks of the reporter: job opportunities, housing, family, land access, property costs and moving with friends. Stigma and discrimination are minor triggers.

3.2 Additional reintegration dimensions

3.2.1 Factional dimensions

While it is discussed in detail under social reintegration (Section 4.1), it is pertinent to note here that reporters do not turn to other reporters in any significant number for economic assistance. In fact reporters rely first on their family for economic help. This is particularly the case for younger reporters. Only 3.1% of reporters turn to friends who are reporters when seeking financial or other economic assistance. This indicates the degree to which most reporters' social-economic networks do not rely on former command

structures for economic advancement. It should be noted that the degree to which reporters state they turn to non-reporter friends for assistance does not fully correspond with the number of non-reporter friends held by reporters: it exceeds the number of non-reporter friends.

3.2.2 Economic dimensions

All key indicators identify that reporters and community are economically reintegrated. These indicators are baseline household indicators where reporters and community members display limited differences. Moreover unemployment and employment trajectories identify that a higher percentage of reporters are unemployed than the community. In line with other data, this shows that the labor market is not stratified in any significant way to either section off reporters from community or to have a negative bias against reporters. The indicators identify that there are vulnerable sub-groups who are more at risk economically, particularly female and disabled reporters. The analysis tracks the economic progression of 31-40 year old reporters in comparison to the same group in the community, and this illustrates how reporters are figuratively one step behind community members in terms of establishing the sustainability of their income and accessing credit.⁹ However, practically, reporters have reintegrated economically to an extent that much of their economic hardship is in many ways comparable to that of the community and a symptom of wider development challenges.

⁹ Reporters were questioned using a 10 step ladder response prompt. Their responses are tabulated (annex 2 table B14 and section 4.5) and by mean score. The lower the mean score means that the respondent is closer to the bottom rung of the ladder, that is, where the poorest people tend to be. The higher the mean score means that the respondent is closer to the highest rung on the ladder, where the wealthy are. Community members like reporters tend to rate themselves somewhere in the middle of the bottom half of the ladder in response to all questions regarding current and past status in food poverty; housing; clothing and finances. However the community is nearly always one rung above the reporter groups reflecting the more positive self-perception but also the fact that as a group the community tends to be slightly more food secure, slightly better housed, slightly better in terms of clothing and slightly better in finances but not to a large extent.

4. Social and Political Reintegration

Sustainable social reintegration includes the reconstruction of the societal bonds that were deconstructed by conflict. It includes the harmonization of reporters and community and the re-establishment of shared beliefs, norms, social opportunity and social inclusion that are based on principles of democracy, peace and dialogue.

4.1 Social networks

At the heart of social reintegration are functioning social networks. In the study, the composition, sustainability and functionality of the social networks of reporters and communities was assessed in order to accurately gauge how well these basic pathways to social reintegration and social inclusion were working for each group.

At the core of most social networks is the family when functioning well. Reporter family networks are strong and reporters have full/high contact with family. This applies across all demographics. The frequency of contact also applies across all demographics with most having daily contact, which is the same as the community.

That said, the economic and social support networks of reporters are limited in size in comparison to those of community members. For example, fewer reporters belong to social networks than ordinary community members and reporters generally have a smaller number of good friends than community members. Having less friends and the fact that female reporters in particular have a limited social circle and stunted social networks is a limitation on personal security and a stressor of mental health. Risks of isolation will

increase in some cases compounding the trauma already endured as a result of conflict.

4.2 Perceptions of community, trust and solidarity

Reporters and communities are very well socially integrated together and have broadly similar understandings of the dynamics of their communities. Reporters generally feel valued in their community. Female reporters, young reporters aged 18-30 and disabled reporters record the highest percentages who feel lowly valued. Most community members (and reporters) believe they personally have a positive impact on their communities (81.3% and 82.1% respectively). The study finds that 68.5% of community members believe they are highly valued, 29.8% medium valued and only 1.7% lowly valued compared to 59.0%, 35.6% and 5.4% of reporters respectively. Female and male community members have comparable responses. In comparison to female reporters, female community members feel more highly valued than medium valued: 70.2% of female reporters say they are highly valued and 26.3% that they are medium valued compared to 48.0% and 44.1% of female reporters respectively.

There is little difference between community and reporters regarding trust. In all areas there is close to parity: (i) the extent to which people in the community can be trusted; (ii) whom can be trusted in society across the categories of people, (iii) explanation of the reasons of changes in levels of trust. What this indicates is that there is broad agreement on levels of trust but reporters who historically are likely to have had more exposure to strangers and the military are

more trusting of all the main categories of individuals about which they were asked than the community.¹⁰ Most reporters are confident enough to be open about their past. Reporters and community strongly share the same perception of the high levels of diversity in their communities and, while they both recognize that diversity and difference can contribute to conflict, the conflict identified does not appear to have anything to do with the wars of the past or with anyone being a reporter. The significant majority of reporters feel part of the community as does a similar percentage of community members.

4.3. Empowerment and social change

Of those who identify that they have either little or no control over decisions affecting their everyday life, female community members are the most disempowered as well as members of the community aged 18-30 years. The same groups have similar responses when identifying the degree to which they have the ability to make important decisions that can change the course of their life. The following identify that they are unable to change their life: female community (15.8%); community 18-30 year olds (10.7%); female reporters (16.7%) and reporters aged 18-30 years old (10.3%). Community members aged 31-40 have the lowest negative response with only 2.5% identifying that they are unable compared to 8.0% of reporters in the same age category. This set of responses confirms the profiles of all five groups: female community members and female reporters are more disempowered than males in each group. Younger community members and younger reporters are also similarly disempowered, and the most established economic and socially networked sub-group of the community respondents (those aged 31-40 years) is the least disempowered when making decisions that impact on the course of their lives.

4.4 Additional reintegration dimensions

4.4.1 Factional dimensions

Reporters have a diverse body of friends, even if in size their social networks are more limited than those of community members. In composition reporters have a similar network of friends to community members. This diverse body of friends mainly contains few fellow reporters, indicating that reporters are successful-

ly reintegrating and diversifying their social networks rather than relying on old command structures and former comrades in rebellion.

4.4.2 Political dimensions

Political reintegration includes the extent to which reporters resort to democratic or civil means for resolving disputes and the degree to which they have faith in the workings of the state in principle. It also includes the degree to which reporters participate in collective political action and in leadership roles in the community or the economy. In the sample for this study, reporters were less politically active than community members. In the last year, half of reporters and two thirds of community members have joined other people to express concerns to GoU officials or local leaders on issues benefiting the community. So while a sizeable percentage has joined, it is still less than the general community. Also, politically active community members are twice as likely to be active multiple times. This indicates that despite reporters feeling valued and a part of the community, and in general able to be open about their past, there is still a reluctance to engage in open political activity to the extent that the community generally does.

Regarding leadership roles in the community or economy, reporters are nearly half as likely to be in a management role in comparison to the community: one quarter of reporters are in such a role compared to nearly half of the community. This ratio is largely consistent across the demographics of reporter and community. This indicates that reporters, while participating in formal networks, are not as prominent in those networks and are not in leadership roles. Anecdotally this is not universal and in some areas of Uganda, particularly where formal demobilization took place more than 10 years ago, reporters have successfully taken leadership roles in associations and in local public administration.

Political reintegration also relates to the level of confidence in the democratic state and its instruments. The study found that approximately 10% less community members than reporters trust government employees, security ministries and the police and military.

¹⁰ Strangers; private business owners or entrepreneurs; and government employees in the security ministries, UPDF and youth.

5. DDR Process

The study examined reporters and community experiences and expectations regarding the DDR process. Data and analysis in annexes 1 and 2 can give a richer understanding of the processes involved.

Findings are disaggregated by stages in the DDR process and then by reporter evaluation of the AC. It is important to bear in mind that aside from how reporters may return to their communities, the DDR process is not uniform for all reporters: the main variable is when reporters received amnesty.

Table 4. Reinsertion assistance: Time between SSD or formal demobilization and amnesty

Did you receive the AC package - in other words reinsertion assistance?	Time between SSD and formal demobilization and amnesty (years)					
	0 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	63.5%	0.0%	75.0%	87.5%	100.0%	68.7%
No	36.5%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	31.3%
	1-4 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	58.0%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%	59.7%
No	42.0%	100.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%
	5-9 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	33.3%	0.0%	84.6%	0.0%	100.0%	40.3%
No	66.7%	100.0%	15.4%	100.0%	0.0%	59.7%
	10-14 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	0.0%	21.1%	100.0%	71.4%	0.0%	22.6%
No	100.0%	78.9%	0.0%	28.6%	100.0%	77.4%
	15-19 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	84.2%	100.0%	74.1%
No	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	25.9%

Table 5. Receipt of reinsertion assistance (by armed group and year of receipt of amnesty)

	2008				2009				2010			
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes	60.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	68.4%	14.3%	93.3%	85.0%	25.0%	25.0%	72.7%	86.7%
No	40.0%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	31.6%	85.7%	6.7%	15.0%	75.0%	75.0%	27.3%	13.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	15	14	6	1	57	14	15	20	68	120	11	15

The factors influencing the overall DDR experience for reporters have been (i) the time between spontaneous self-demobilization or a formal demobilization process and demobilization where amnesty is given; (ii) sensitization and expectations regarding reinsertion; (iii) the high levels of family and community acceptance, and (iv) breaking former command structures. Reintegration involves the preparation of the community for receipt of reporters. By reviewing their experience of the DDR process the community identified sensitization and dispelling fears as key aspects of their experience.

Based on the time between spontaneous self-demobilization or formal demobilization and receipt of amnesty, there is inconsistency with the numbers of reporters who have received reinsertion assistance, although this has decreased in recent years.

While there are various official reasons why some reporters do not receive reinsertion assistance, (reporters may not have spent sufficient time in rebellion, they may be outside the cut-off date for inclusion in a backlog of reporters awaiting reinsertion assistance by the AC or they may have demobilized recently when there has been insufficient funds to pay the reinsertion assistance) the end result is that there is inconsistency across groups and the perceptions of reporters do not reflect the official reasons why they may or may not have received assistance.¹¹

5.1 Reinsertion payment: use, sensitization and expectations

Of those surveyed, 17.0% of reporters identified that their primary needs were met to a large extent by the

reinsertion assistance, 31% to a medium extent, and 52.0% to a small extent. Despite this, only 31.1% of the female reporters, 41.9% of males and 42.6% of disabled reporters identified that their expectations (what they perceived they were entitled to) were met and they did receive the rehabilitative process they were expecting. Gender has no significant impact on the analysis of reinsertion payments but the average payment to female reporters is still less than their male counterparts.¹² There is a correlation between the amount of information received by reporters and the likelihood of receiving payments from the AC. In other words, it appears that if reporters are appropriately sensitized then they are more likely to be able to navigate the reinsertion system and access support.

11 The AC explained that the reasons why a reporter may or may not receive a package are well known. The report gives other reasons, and more criteria were added after the World Bank reporter backlog audit. One of the key reasons, other than insufficient funds, is that effective in 2006, the AC decided not to give reinsertion packages to reporters who had stayed in the community for more than two years. For example, during the implementation of UgDRP, a total of 3,342 reporters were demobilized. Of these, over 2,000 WNBF reporters and others had lived in the community for more than 2 years and as such they did not receive any re-insertion package. However all reporters are entitled to other benefits like referrals, training, and startup capital. During the implementation of UgDRP, a total of 3,360 reporters received reinsertion packages of whom 3052 were backlog (demobilized before 2008 but not given reinsertion packages at the time) and 308 were trickle-in (freshly demobilized) reporters.

12 The AC explained that except in situations where some activities (like training) are specifically targeted to different genders, all reporters, whether females or males, received the same benefits. For example the re-insertion package given by AC is the same (both the monetary and the physical items) for both males and females (and even children above 12 years of age).

5.2 Community experiences

The community was sensitized about formal reinsertion mainly through the radio (34.8%) and word of mouth (25.9%). Only 17.1% were informed via community meetings but this is by far the preferred means of communication by the community. 12.7% of community members identify that they were not informed.

5.3 Additional reintegration dimensions

5.3.1 Factional dimensions

A dimension of successful or unsuccessful reintegration is the extent to which reporters break or continue to maintain ties with other reporters and former commanders. The study finds that reporters have very little contact with former commanders and to a large extent do not benefit materially from residual command structures. However, these structures still exist: in the field work for this study former commanders assisted the field teams to identify and locate difficult to find reporters who had been randomly chosen for the sample.

It is evident from responses that contact with former commanders does not convert into gains in employment or income generating opportunities: 93.3% of reporters state that they do not acquire income generating opportunities in this way, 4.6% seldom and 2.1% often. There is no variance across genders and age categories.

Reporters reflected on the elements of the DDR process during which they were in contact with the AC and responded as follows: 53.3% of reporters were satisfied and 20.2% dissatisfied with the content of the reintegration package given by the AC; 41.3% were satisfied and 44.3% were dissatisfied with the cash component of the AC reinsertion package; 51.6% were satisfied with the local regional office administration of the reinsertion process and 31.5% were dissatisfied.

Regarding gender there is approximate parity in satisfaction and dissatisfaction rates in female and male reporters for: (i) preparation for demobilization and (ii) work of regional AC offices. Disparities exist in relation to the content of the reinsertion package where

60.3% of female reporters in comparison to 50.8% of males are satisfied, and 13.7% dissatisfied compared to 22.6% of males. Disparities also exist regarding the cash component of the reinsertion package: 52.6% of female reporters and 37.6% of male reporters are satisfied with the component and 29.8% of female reporters are dissatisfied compared to 49.1% of male reporters. Throughout each aspect of reinsertion, disability is also a factor. Approximately 50% of disabled reporters are satisfied with each aspect. The highest proportion of dissatisfied is so in relation to the cash component of the reinsertion package (37.5%) and to the work of the regional AC office during the reinsertion process (27.9%).

Dissatisfaction can be expected around reinsertion payments as often these payments are expected to provide for more than simply subsistence, when in fact they are designed to be temporary assistance with only essential items. Arguably information is the main aspect of the work of the AC which could affect reporters' satisfaction. Across the sample, the experiences with AC sensitization activities were mediocre at best, and there is confusion regarding eligibility for reinsertion assistance and the reasons for same.

5.3.2 Social dimensions

On the whole reporters were welcomed by their families (only 2.6% said that their families were unwelcoming) and many were quickly accepted by their communities. 72.9% of reporters said that the community was totally accepting and 26.3% that it was partially accepting.

In general, the kind of exclusion and barriers to reintegration experienced by reporters is rarely physically violent and is more symptomatic of the rebuilding of ties with the community in the state of uncertainty by all parties and the perceived caution of the community in accepting back some reporters. The reporters of the ADF experienced these exclusions more than reporters from the other armed groups.

Taking frequency of meeting as an indicator, it is clear that reporter and community are well integrated. Only 13.2% of community members do not have direct contact with reporters. Community fears pertaining to reporters which were evident at formal reinsertion are now largely dispelled. Originally 56.4% of community

members had fears relating to reporters and now only 3.3% of the community has fears about reporters.

The community is largely confident that it behaved appropriately in terms of welcoming reporters back and facilitating their reintegration. Only 21.8% of community members believe the community should have behaved differently. Of this 21.8%, 17.9% believed the community should have provided more general support; 25.0% believe the community could have better shown respect, forgiveness and welcome to male reporters, and 14.3% believe the community could have

better avoided isolating male reporters, blaming them and creating stigma.¹³ Given the overall picture of reintegration the reflection of over three quarters of the community that they behaved appropriately indicates how well the community welcomed back reporters.

13 This is based on how community members were asked first regarding female reporters and second regarding male reporters. The division by gender was given in the questions so community members were prompted to think about female and male reporters separately .

6. Conclusions

The study surveyed 410 reporters and 182 community members in order to examine the reintegration experiences of both groups and gauge the level of reintegration of reporters in Ugandan communities. The survey was conducted in seven locations corresponding with the locations of the AC DRTs.

The study found that reporters and civilians in Uganda are successfully reintegrating, economically and socially and that this is an outcome of various complex multi-dimensional peace and stability interventions in Uganda. This is also a foundation upon which relevant development programs such as CDD and IGA initiatives can be implemented in the future.

6.1 Economic reintegration

Despite chronic development challenges, communities have been largely welcoming and accepting of reporters including into economic networks. Communities and reporters share an understanding that reporters face additional challenges to economically catch up with the community. Reporters attest that they rarely suffer discrimination in the workplace on the basis of their insurgent history. Reporter employment trajectory is positive (and while the unemployment rate is twice that of community members it is still relatively low at under 10%). The nature of reporter employment closely corresponds with that of the rest of the community. This reveals that there is little distinction between reporter and community regarding the sectors in which reporters are employed or studying and the percentage in each sector. What this shows is that the labour market is not stratified in any significant way to either section off reporters from community or to have a negative bias against reporters.

However, reporters face greater difficulties accessing micro-credit than community members and are less involved in micro-economic activities than community members. At least partially, difficulties around credit are related to challenges in reestablishing the economic linkages that were disrupted by the conflict. This also reflects on the finding that while largely economically reintegrated, reporters generally have greater challenges establishing their economic sustainability, most likely because of the stage where many reporters find themselves in their economic life.

Within reporter groups, female reporters are an at-risk group with less access to economic networks. The characteristics of the economic activities of reporters in the 31-40 year category are less established than those of the corresponding demographic group in the community.

6.1.1 Community driven development

The level of economic reintegration is such that reporters and communities would significantly benefit from IGA programs, particularly those that are capable of targeting vulnerable sub-groups across the reporter-community population. One example of such programming is CDD (such as NUSAF) targeting income generation. Vulnerable community members, particularly females, would benefit from targeting in a CDD initiative in order to enable them to become less reliant on credit to meet household expenses and to become better economically and socially networked. CDD with a sub-component in micro-finance would likely greatly assist reporters increase their access to credit to a level similar to fellow community members. Similarly, CDD supports reporters in assuming leadership positions on a comparable basis with com-

community members (for example on management committees) may contribute to equalizing the findings around reporter under-participation in leadership positions in associations, including economic associations.

6.1.2 Rural-urban periphery

Most reporters who reside in the rural-urban periphery are most likely of all reporters who are engaged in agriculture to meet monthly expenses and break even financially at the end of each month. Economically they are performing significantly better than those in rural settlements or isolated homesteads but with the same economic profile. This is likely because access to urban markets improves the ability to generate income. It would benefit reporters and community members—in particular vulnerable sub-groups such as women who are functional household heads—to be targeted by CDD projects focusing on the development of the rural and private sector. This would include support to producers and local administration in order to improve efficiencies along the value chain of agricultural commodities and improve infrastructure to facilitate the same.

6.2 Social reintegration

In the surveyed communities there is good social reintegration of reporters and communities. Reporters tend to have strong family support and integration, however they do encounter more challenges regarding marriage, particularly female reporters. Reporters generally have a far higher rate of separation and marriage breakdown than non-combatant community members.

Similarly, reporters encounter risks pertaining to the size of their social networks. While reporter and community social networks are comparable in composition to those of other community members they are more limited in size. That said, reporters feel valued in their community and generally are valued as equally as any other community member. Across most indicators including stigma, security, acceptance and empowerment, reporters are largely on par with community members. Factional reintegration is positive with all relevant indicators in social (and economic) reintegration indicating that many linkages with command

structures have been deconstructed by reporters and that they value the diversity of their social networks.

It is concerning that younger reporters believe their position in development is not only ‘one step’ below that of the community but also that in all key areas (food, housing, clothing and finance). In the last twelve months their situation has worsened. However, generally reporters and community members consistently identify themselves in the poorest half of society (between steps 2 and 3 on a 9-step ladder) and within one step on the scale of each other with reporters being lower and so poorer according to their own perception in all areas. Also, community respondents in the 18-30 year olds category state that their situation has worsened.

6.2.1 Younger reporters

The social and economic exclusion of younger reporters (including those not addressed in this study, i.e. under 18 years old) in post-conflict recovery is a crucial issue that should be addressed in future development interventions particularly any economically focused CDD programs as mentioned above. While in general reporters appear socially and psychologically resilient, the pressure exerted by social exclusion as evidenced in the pessimism of the younger cohort in this study is cause for concern.

6.2.2 Female community members

Female community members not only endure economic disadvantage but, in comparison to female reporters, they also endure more social marginalization. Females in the community have less participation in formal gatherings, are more isolated, more at risk in terms of personal security and so more conscious of safety and security issues than males. Despite having similar social network challenges to female community members, female reporters are likely to be more secure socially, economically and in how they perceive the security of the external environment. Future programs targeting the reintegration of female reporters should include a larger cohort of female civilians to promote social and economic inclusion of this subgroup. All future programming should be more gender sensitive than DDR programs to date in Uganda.

Annexes

Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Project BENEFICIARY ASSESSMENT

Annexes

Contents

ANNEX 1	30
REPORTER REINTEGRATION SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	30
1. DEMOGRAPHICS	31
1.1 DEMOGRAPHICS INCLUDING MEMBERSHIP OF ARMED GROUPS	32
1.1.1. <i>Personal history of armed rebellion</i>	32
1.2 HEALTH, DISABILITY, MARRIAGE AND HOUSEHOLD	33
1.3 EDUCATION, SKILLS AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING	36
1.4. COMPARISON OF KEY FINDINGS TO THE COMMUNITY SURVEY	37
1.4.1 <i>Health, disability, marriage and household.</i>	37
1.4.2 <i>Education, skills and vocational training</i>	38
1.5 SUMMARY	39
2. HOUSING, GENERAL SECURITY, LAND, LIVESTOCK AND FOOD SECURITY	41
2.1 DWELLING, LIVING CONDITIONS AND LAND SECURITY	41
2.2 SAFETY AND SECURITY	43
2.3 LAND USAGE AND FOOD SECURITY	46
2.3.1 <i>Hunger</i>	49
2.4 SUMMARY	50
3. ECONOMIC ISSUES AND MIGRATION	52
3.1 ECONOMIC STATUS AND HISTORY	52
3.2 NON-ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE REPORTERS ON EMPLOYMENT ISSUES.....	55
3.3 WOMEN REPORTERS ON EMPLOYMENT ISSUES	56
3.4 DISABLED REPORTERS ON EMPLOYMENT ISSUES	57
3.5 INCOME, SAVINGS AND ACCESS TO CREDIT	57
3.6 ECONOMIC ASSOCIATIONS	59
3.7 MIGRATION	60
3.8 FINDINGS AND SUMMARY COMPARISON WITH THE COMMUNITY	63
4. SOCIAL CAPITAL	66
4.1 NETWORKS AND SOCIABILITY	66
4.2 TRUST AND SOLIDARITY	69
4.3 SOCIAL COHESION AND INCLUSION	71
4.4 EMPOWERMENT	73
4.5 SOCIAL CHANGE	74
4.6 SUMMARY	76
5. DDR EXPERIENCES	78
5.1 RECEPTION AND RETURN	78
5.2 DEMOBILIZATION	79
5.3 REINSERTION	80
5.3.1 <i>Use of Reinsertion Payment</i>	83
5.3.2 <i>Reporters' experience of the AC</i>	85
5.3.3 <i>Reporters' experience with CFPs</i>	86
5.4 REINTEGRATION	86
5.4.1 <i>Reintegration with the family</i>	88
5.4.2 <i>Reintegration and the community</i>	88
5.5 FINDINGS	89
6. CONCLUSIONS.....	91
6.1 LAND, FOOD SECURITY AND CONFLICT	91

6.2 ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION	92
6.3 SOCIAL REINTEGRATION.....	93
6.4 VULNERABLE GROUPS.....	93
ANNEX 2	95
COMMUNITY DYNAMICS SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.....	95
1. DEMOGRAPHICS	96
1.1 DEMOGRAPHICS	96
1.2 HEALTH, DISABILITY, MARRIAGE AND HOUSEHOLD	97
1.3 EDUCATION, SKILLS AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING	98
1.4 SUMMARY	99
2. HOUSING, SECURITY, LAND, LIVESTOCK AND FOOD SECURITY	100
2.1 SAFETY AND SECURITY	101
2.2 LAND USAGE AND FOOD SECURITY	102
2.2.1 <i>Hunger</i>	104
2.3 SUMMARY	105
3. ECONOMIC ISSUES AND MIGRATION	107
3.1 ECONOMIC STATUS AND HISTORY	107
3.2 NON-ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE COMMUNITY MEMBERS ON EMPLOYMENT ISSUES	109
3.3 WOMEN COMMUNITY MEMBERS ON EMPLOYMENT ISSUES.....	110
3.4 INCOME, SAVINGS AND ACCESS TO CREDIT	110
3.5 ECONOMIC ASSOCIATIONS.....	111
3.6 MIGRATION.....	111
3.7 SUMMARY	114
4. SOCIAL CAPITAL	116
4.1 NETWORKS AND SOCIABILITY	116
4.2 TRUST AND SOLIDARITY	118
4.3 SOCIAL COHESION AND INCLUSION.....	119
4.4 EMPOWERMENT	120
4.5 SOCIAL CHANGE	121
4.6 SUMMARY	122
5. REINTEGRATION EXPERIENCES.....	124
5.1 COMMUNITY SENSITIZATION AND PREPAREDNESS	124
5.2 HISTORIC COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES ON REPORTER REINTEGRATION AND FEAR	124
5.3 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE REPORTER BEHAVIOR	125
6. CONCLUSIONS.....	126
6.1 THE COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION	126
6.2 THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL REINTEGRATION	127
6.3 FEMALE COMMUNITY SUB-GROUP	127

Annex 1

REPORTER REINTEGRATION SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

1. Demographics

Following is a capture of the full demographics of the reporter sample for the study. The demographics are not those of the overall reporter population, rather they reflect the bias in the study towards (i) the proportional makeup of the reporter population based on greater or smaller number of reporters from each armed group registered, (ii) a resulting bias towards younger reporters and older reporters (18-30 years and over 40 years) because of the profile of LRA reporters (younger) and WNBFB reporters (older).¹

Looking at the gender age breakdown for the entire sample of 410 reporters the bias is more evident. Of the total 410 reporters surveyed the sample is composed of 11.8% female and 26.8% male reporters aged 18-30 years; 3.4% female and 21.1% male reporters aged 31-40 years, and 10.3% female and 26.5% male reporters aged over 40 years.

The four main armed groups discussed in this report are the LRA, WNBFB, ADF, UNRF and together they constitute the majority of reporters (401).

Table A1. Distribution of sample by armed group and sub-categories

	Name of armed faction reporter belonged to								
	LRA	WNBFB	ADF	UPA	UNRF	UPDA	NALU	PRA	UPF
Male	71.5%	81.6%	71.4%	100.0%	60.5%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female	28.5%	18.4%	28.6%	.0%	39.5%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Subtotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
18-30 years	83.5%	4.5%	22.9%	.0%	9.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
31-40 years	15.2%	31.2%	45.7%	33.3%	18.6%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
Over 40 years	1.2%	64.3%	31.4%	66.7%	72.1%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Subtotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Non disabled person	77.1%	84.8%	93.9%	100.0%	85.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Disabled person	22.9%	15.2%	6.1%	.0%	14.3%	66.7%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
Subtotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Count	165	158	35	3	43	3	1	1	1

Of the total 410 sample 70 reporters were disabled (17.1%). Focusing specifically at the proportion of disabled reporters within the various armed factions, it was found that 21.2% of the LRA reporters were disabled; 15.2% of the WNBFB reporters were disabled; 5.7% of the ADF reporters were disabled, and 14% of the UNRF reporters were disabled. During the fieldwork and at least partially because of having to work outside the main and subsidiary lists of reporters the teams encountered a greater number of disabled reporters than originally envisaged.

Table A1 above gives a detailed breakdown of the sample cross-tabulated by membership of armed group. The LRA sample had the greatest proportion of young reporters between the ages of 18-30 years at 83.5% of the total LRA sample. The WNBFB had the majority of its reporters the over 40- years of age (64.3% of the WNBFB sample). The majority of the ADF reporters (45.7%) were aged 31-40 years. Whereas most of the UNRF reporters were over 40 years comprising 72.1% of the UNRF sample.

¹ There is no consistent way to identify the age of reporters for a sample because the AC's ICRS sometimes records the age of reporters at one or more of the following: (i) age at date of registration, (ii) D.O.B declared at date of registration, (iii) date of registration. Consequently the consultant estimated the birth year and age of the reporters using whatever field was available.

When asked only 41.95% of the reporters were aware of their year they entered their armed group whether through abduction or volunteering reflecting how many of the reporters were children when they were abducted into their respective armed groups. Very few LRA respondents knew their age when they were abducted to the group however most could identify that they were children, below 18 years or over. This flags that some of the responses to historical questions must be treated carefully as concrete dates and figures are more unreliable when recounted by young reporters also with a traumatic personal history.

The aspects of the lives of reporters discussed in this section are key indicators of the barriers reporters are encountering to accessing pathways to reintegration and explore the gender and disability dynamics of such barriers. Pathways to reintegration are available through the family, through gaining education and training, and through addressing health needs. As is discussed below there are definite gender and age dynamics which affect how female reporters experience barriers to reintegration and the frequency with which they experience same, particularly in accessing family networks through marriage, literacy and educational attainment. There are also age dimensions that apply across the three age categories in the sample.

1.1 Demographics including membership of armed groups

Following is an examination of the pertinent demographics of reporters in the study and a snapshot of their time with their particular armed group.

1.1.1. Personal history of armed rebellion

The gender of reporters determined to a large extent how they became involved with their armed group. Significantly more female reporters were abducted into their rebel groups than male reporters. 52.8% of male reporters were abducted into their rebel groups, or in support of those groups, compared to 70.9% of women. Closer examination of the female cohort identifies that 92.9% of female reporters currently aged between 18 to 30 years were abducted.

Regarding spontaneous self-demobilization (when a reporter left the bush and returned to a community) and formal demobilization (when a reporter received amnesty) the majority of the sample (42.1%) had waited between 10 to 14 years between spontaneous self-demobilization or formal demobilization and receiving amnesty. On average, the amount of time between spontaneous self-demobilization and amnesty varied significantly depending on the armed faction. It was found that UNRF reporters waited on average 16 years, the WNBF reporters 12 years, the ADF 5 years and the LRA 3 years.

Table A2. Wait for amnesty (mean scores)

Difference between when first informally demobilized and when formally demobilised				
	Mean	N	Minimum	Maximum
LRA	3.34	164	0	16
WNBF	12.39	157	3	24
ADF	4.53	34	0	11
UNRF	15.70	37	0	22
Other armed faction	8.86	7	0	22
Total	8.25	399	0	24

Factors that clearly influence the duration between spontaneous self-demobilization or formal demobilization and amnesty or have some correlation with same are: (i) on average reporters who at the time of the survey are over 40 years of age had to wait the longest at 13 years; (ii) on average reporters who were abducted waited less time than those respondents that volunteered, 5 years as opposed to 12 years; (iii) respondents with a security background waited longer than those without, and (iv) gender is not

a factor in the time between informal and formal demobilization. More reporters from the LRA have waited only between 0 and 4 years for demobilization compared to all the other groups: 32.9% at 0 years and 31.7% at 1-4 years compared to 0% and 1.9% of WNBF reporters, 11.8% and 41.2% of ADF reporters; 5.4% and 0% of UNRF reporters. Of the sample the UNRF reporters have the largest percentage who have waited the longest time for demobilization: 54.1% have waiting 15-19 years and 18.9% have waited 20 to 24 years compared to 0.6% of LRA waiting 15-19 years and 0.0 waiting 20-24 years; 0.0% of WNBF waiting 15 to 19 years 0.6% waiting 20-24 years; 0.0% of ADF for either time period. Of the WNBF 93.0% have waited 10 to 14 years. The long waiting periods can be explained by reporters self-demobilizing and then receiving amnesty much later and mainly during the UgDRP 2008 – 2010 when reached by formal AC-lead sensitization or sensitization via the old command structures and through NGOs, CBOs, FBOs or churches.

1.2 Health, disability, marriage and household

The current medical status of reporters is such that there is a higher percentage of female reporters than male who identify as chronically ill (17.4% of females in comparison to 8.4% of males). There is also a higher percentage of female reporters in treatment for psycho-social problems (2.5% in comparison to 0.5% of males). Other ill health issues - both psychological and physiological - have a correlation across genders including health problems as a result of torture or beatings during conflict (0.6% of females and 0.7% of males). Age has some bearing on health and illness with 12% of those aged 18-30 years indicating that they are chronically ill compared to 7.1% of those aged 31-40 years and 12.1% of those aged over 40.² A larger proportion of the 18-30 year olds were healthy across the LRA, WNBF, UNRF but not the ADF. The ADF hold the greatest proportion of unhealthy young people aged 18-30 years. Also, the ADF have the highest proportion of chronically ill reporters in this age category: 37.5% compared to 15.3% of LRA; 14.3% of WNBF and 0.0% of UNRF. Of the disabled sample 48.6% indicated that they were undergoing treatment for their disability.

Table A3. Current medical status (by armed group)

Current medical status of respondent	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Healthy	58.8%	62.0%	62.9%	48.8%
Handicapped - undergoing treatment	9.1%	8.9%	2.9%	4.7%
Handicapped - waiting for medical rehabilitation	12.1%	6.3%	2.9%	9.3%
Chronically ill	13.3%	7.6%	22.9%	23.3%
Psycho-social issues - undergoing treatment	.6%	1.3%	5.7%	.0%
Psycho-social issues - awaiting treatment for psycho-social issues	.6%	.6%	2.9%	2.3%
Underlying health ailments, unhealthy	4.2%	13.3%	.0%	9.3%
Health ailments from torture or beatings during conflict	1.2%	.0%	.0%	2.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	165	158	35	43

During demobilization all reporters are to be afforded health screening to facilitate treatment or rehabilitation. Health screening includes examination and diagnosis of psychological and physical health and disability. In the sample 397 of the target of 410 were formally demobilized during the UgDRP, between 2008 and 2011. In the survey, only those reporters that self-identified as disabled were asked to indicate whether or not they were screened for disability on demobilization. In total, of those disabled and currently undergoing treatment, 17.1% had been screened for disability.

Female reporters are significantly less likely to be married than male reporters: 16.5% of females are married monogamous and 14.6% married polygamous whereas 46.6% of males are married monogamous

² chronically ill includes chronic pain as a result of bullet or shrapnel wounds, a common complaint in northern Uganda

and 24.6% are married polygamous. Of female reporters 6.8% are living with their partners but are unmarried compared to 5.6% of males. Similarly marriage separation rates and the frequency with which the spouse had died are much higher in females in males: 14.6% of female reporters are separated from their spouse and 27.2% are widows compared to 3.6% of male reporters who are separated and 2.0% who are widowers. A large number of young reporters (39.1%) are adults who have never married. 2.9% of female reporters identified that prior to demobilization they were in a forced relationship, in comparison to 0.7% of males. For females this statistic drops to 1.0% at the point of formal demobilization meaning that 1.9% remained in forced relationships at formal demobilization.

Disabled reporters tend to be married monogamous or polygamous 31.4% and 18.4% respectively and 10% of disabled reporters are living with their partners but are unmarried. Also 10% are separated and 1.4% are divorced. A high percentage of disabled reporters have marriage partners who have died (20.0%) and similar to the overall percentages of female and males, 15.7% of disabled reporters are single adults who have never married.

As can be expected currently the largest proportion of LRA reporters are single adults who never married (37.6%), followed by married (29.1%). Of WNBF reporters 41.7% and 36.7% are married monogamous or married polygamous respectively. Of ADF reporters 51.4% and 31.4% are married monogamous and married polygamous respectively and 48.8% and 23.3% of UNRF reporters married monogamous and married polygamous respectively.

Analyzing further the statistics around marriage breakdown including attitudinal indicators pertaining to whether or not those unmarried reporters in the survey would marry another reporter there is an explanatory conclusions explaining why female reporters have such a low marriage level. Female reporters are more likely to be married to a male reporter than a male reporter is to be married to a female reporter:

It was found that of those who are married, living together, divorced or separated (that is, not single) 43.3% of female reporters have at any one time been involved with a reporter compared to only 12.2% of male reporters. The armed group that does not get involved with reporters are those from the WNBF. It was found that only 6.9% of WNBF reporters had ever (past and present) been involved with a reporter, compared to the LRA at 26.4%, ADF and 37.5% and UNRF at 25%.

Table A4. Divorce and separation

If divorced or separated, did the divorce or separation have anything to do with you having been a reporter?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	13	2.2	32.5	32.5
	No	27	4.6	67.5	100.0
	Total	40	6.8	100.0	
Missing	No response	21	3.5		
	Not applicable	349	59.0		
	System	182	30.7		
	Total	552	93.2		
Total		592	100.0		

For those whose marriages have broken down 39.5% of female reporters had been married to a reporter and 8.0% of male reporters had been married to a reporter. Furthermore for female reporters 26.1% indicated that the divorce was in some part caused by them being a reporter and 41.2% of male reporters indicated that it did. Reporters were reluctant to discuss the reasons why the divorce or separation was attributed to them being a reporter. Of reporters who had divorced 32.5% opted to explain why their divorce or separation was attributed to them being a reporter. Of the respondents 15 are LRA reporters; 20 are WNBF reporters; 2 are ADF reporters and 3 are UNRF reporters.

Of the 13 (of 40) reporters who positively identified why their divorce or separation was attributed to them having been a reporter three each explained that (i) it was because of emotional abuse where they lived in fear of their reporter spouse or partners, and (ii) that they had escaped from the bush leaving their spouse behind. Two reporters indicated that they had been abducted or that they had been in prison and their spouse left them. One reporter each responded: (i) there were circumstantial events; (ii) there were no one to look after their children; (iii) they went into the bush without their spouse's permission; (iv) they were arrested and because of this they have never met up with their spouse, and (v) their spouse's family is a negative influence or because of stigma.

Regarding attitudinal indicators, unmarried reporters were asked whether or not they would ever consider marrying a reporter and responded as follows (responses from polygamous reporters were included in the analysis also): 54.2% of unmarried reporters indicated that they would consider marry a reporter. While the response numbers are low (37 reporters) this 45.8% that responded negatively explained their reasons as follows: of male reporters the highest response (five reporters) indicated that it was because of the psychosocial problems, something which also featured with females (two reporters). For male reporters the second most frequent reason (three reporters) was that their own experience in the bush would prevent them. For female reporters the next most frequent response was the stigma linked to reporters or the perceived criminal behavior of reporters (two reporters).

In summary, (i) female reporters are significantly less likely to be married than male reporters; (ii) reporter marriage separation rates and the frequency with which the spouse had died are much higher in females in males, and (iii) over half of reporters who are unmarried and not in a relationship indicated that they would consider marry a reporter. These findings suggest that in so far as female reporters are less likely to have a family and be married than their male counterparts they are then more likely to be outside a primary social unit for reintegration, the family. The questions that follow then are (i) does this differ from non-reporter women; and (ii) does this contribute to less successful reintegration of female reporters.³

The average household size from reporters is 10 persons. 33.3% of female reporters are themselves the head of the household with overall financial responsibility for the household as compared to 47.4% of male reporters. Perhaps reflecting the 18-30 year olds full composition of the sample, 19.2% of female reporters and 21.8% of male reporters rely on parents and grandparents to the primary unit with responsibility for the financial wellbeing of the household. A small difference exists where other family members are identified as responsible with 10.1% of female reporters identifying this to be the case and 7.5% of males. A striking difference is where 7.1% of females indicate that children in the household are financial responsible for the key functions with 0.3% of male reporters indicating positively.

When analyzed by armed group as expected the majority of LRA reporters live in a household where their parents or grandparents are household heads and responsible for the provision of nutrition: 41.5%. 26.4% are responsible themselves. Of LRA reporters 10.7% have spouses who are responsible and 10.1% have combined responsibility with their spouse. This compares to WNBFB reporters of which 43.3% are self-responsible, 12.0% have spouses who are responsible and 23.3% share responsibility with their spouse. ADF reporters have 48.5% self-responsible, 6.1% have spouses who are responsible and 33.3% share responsibility with their spouse. 32.4% of UNRF reporters are self-responsible, 16.2% have spouses who are responsible and 33.3% share responsibility with their spouses.

³ See also Nordstrom 1991, McKay et al 2006, McKay and Mazurana 2010

1.3 Education, skills and vocational training

Female reporters have a high illiteracy rate: 59.8% of female reporters cannot read or write in comparison to 29.2% of male reporters. The highest illiteracy rates are in the age brackets 18 – 30 year and over 40 years which are 38.3% and 39% of reporters respectively. Disabled reporters display the lowest literacy with 40.6% being unable to read or write. Of all the male respondents, the disabled male respondents aged 18-30 and those who are unhealthy (chronically ill, psycho-social issues, and other health issues) have disproportionately low literacy

Regarding educational achievement the majority of reporters had some primary schooling at demobilization and a similar level at the time of being surveyed: 58.0% and 53.5% respectively with the drop being explained through increases in the number having some secondary (up from 16.7% to 19.6%); some higher education (up from 0.7% to 1.0%), and completed higher education (up from 0.0% to 1.0%).

Table A5. Receipt of vocational training

Have you received any skills or vocational training since returning from the conflict?	Reporter											
	Male						Female					
	Able body person			Disabled person			Able body person			Disabled person		
	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Yes	23.0%	26.7%	28.3%	20.0%	36.4%	35.7%	55.0%	53.8%	46.4%	71.4%	.0%	35.7%
No	77.0%	73.3%	71.7%	80.0%	63.6%	64.3%	45.0%	46.2%	53.6%	28.6%	100.0%	64.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	87	75	92	20	11	14	40	13	28	7	1	14

In vocational training and training 50.5% of female reporters and 26.5% of male reporters had received some form of vocational training since returning from the bush. For all purposes there was an even distribution across age categories for those who have received and those who have not received vocational training. Those who received vocational training are as follows: 18 – 30 years (33.1%), 31 – 40 years (31.0%), over 40 years (33.1%) and those who did not receive training are: 66.9%, 69.0% and 66.9% over the same age categories.

Considering only male reporters above the aged of 31, it is found that they received more training than both the healthy and unhealthy male reporters. This indicates that some of the training from some agency or NGO targeted male disabled persons and is having positive outcomes.

There is evidence to show that both healthy and disabled females aged 18- 30 years are receiving skills training more than any other gender-age cohort, including all males. Female reporters in this category show the highest training and out-perform their community counterparts.

The five most common types of training received by female reporters were: craft-making (34.2%); tailoring (26.3%); bakery (10.5%); agriculture (7.9%), and livestock rearing skills (5.3%). For male reporters this was bricklaying and construction skills (24.7%); agricultural skills (17.8%); carpentry and joinery (15.1%); vehicle repairs (11.0%), and bicycle/motorcycle repairs (6.8%). 60.4% of reporters indicate that they are currently using the skills in which they were trained since returning from conflict. That percentage includes only 23.1% of 18-30 year olds with the larger percentages reserved for 31-40 year olds (72.4%) and over 40 year olds (92.3%). Importantly reporters aged 18-30 are not using skills training received to the same extent as older cohorts.

Of those reporters who indicated that they are not using skills training (39.6%) the top five reasons given were: (i) lack of equipment and facilities (36.0%); (ii) no capital to invest in the business (16.0%); (iii) continuing training or study (12.0%); (iv) had lost the tools or equipment to do the work (6.0%), and (v), there is no opportunity to use the skills gained (4.0%). Of those reporters who identify as being recently skilled (325 reporters) 52.5% are working in the field of skills associated with that vocational training. This 52.5% is composed of 50% female reporters and 54.2% male reporters. The percentage of reporters working in their respective skills sector increases with age: 18-30 years (30.0%); 31-40 years (48.3%); over 40 years 75.0%.

1.4. Comparison of key findings to the Community Survey

Some important distinctions can be made by a partial comparison with responses in the community survey.

1.4.1 Health, disability, marriage and household.

For reporters, females are significantly less likely to be married than their male counterparts. They are also less likely to be married monogamous than comparable their female community members throughout all age categories. However they are more likely to be married polygamous throughout all age categories. Male reporters are more likely to be both married monogamous and married polygamous than their comparable male community member counterparts. Regarding marriage between reporter and civilian, community members rarely marry reporters: only 7.7% of females and 3.4% of males indicate that their spouses are reporters.

Table A6. Marital status (reporter and community)

What is your current marital status?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Married monogamous	46.6%	16.5%	28.8%	55.0%	38.9%	31.4%	56.0%	28.1%	35.7%	67.5%	50.0%
Married polygamous	24.6%	14.6%	8.3%	25.0%	34.2%	11.4%	18.4%	8.8%	6.0%	15.0%	30.4%
Living together	5.6%	6.8%	9.0%	6.0%	2.7%	10.0%	1.6%	5.3%	3.6%	5.0%	.0%
Divorced	.3%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%	.7%	1.4%	.0%	7.0%	1.2%	.0%	5.4%
Separated	3.6%	14.6%	10.3%	3.0%	4.7%	10.0%	.8%	3.5%	.0%	2.5%	3.6%
Widowed	2.0%	27.2%	2.6%	5.0%	16.8%	20.0%	1.6%	10.5%	.0%	5.0%	10.7%
Single child - never married	1.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.2%	5.3%	7.1%	.0%	.0%
Single adult - never married	16.4%	19.4%	39.1%	5.0%	2.0%	15.7%	18.4%	31.6%	46.4%	5.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	305	103	156	100	149	70	125	57	84	40	56

Attitudinal dynamics around the acceptance of reporters as one's spouse identified that 54.2% of reporters indicated that they would consider marry a reporter. In comparison, 56.8% of community members identified that they would also consider marrying a reporter indicating an equivalent level of acceptance as the reporter population. Those community members who indicated that they would not marry a reporter identified similar reasons to those given by the reporter population: stigma, fear of

reporters and the unknown character of individual reporters as a result of poor cultural or community linkages.

Regarding the composition of the household and the identification of household heads, reporters and communities had similar households (average 10 people) and no relevant difference between who in the household is the head, responsible for the financial wellbeing of the household and responsible for food

1.4.2. Education, skills and vocational training

Community members have higher literacy rates than reporters both in reading and writing and in read only or write only. Differences in literacy are increasingly striking across comparative groups: 37.3% of female reporters in comparison to 64.9% of female community members are fully literate. Similarly 61.8% of male reporters in comparison to 84.7% of male community members are fully literate. In an age group comparison the most striking difference is between reporters in the 18-30 years bracket where 55.8% of reporters are literate in comparison to 90.4% of community members.

Similar differences exist in the 31-40 years bracket with 59.0% of reporters being literate and 75% of community members. As can be expected the current educational achievement level of comparative populations of reporter and community member reveals that community members are more highly educated with 19.6 % of reporters having some secondary level education in comparison to 41.9% of community members; 1.2 % of reporters completing secondary in comparison to 4.5% of community members; 1.0% of reporters having some and completing higher education compared with 2.2% and 6.7% of community members respectively

In vocational skills and training reporter and community report similar levels of training and in similar levels per vocation since 2006 except female reporters who are more likely to have received training than their community counterparts: 50.5% of female reporters have been skilled in comparison to 29.8% of female community members.

Reporters have significantly lower literacy and educational achievement than their civilian counterparts and female and young reporters fare unfavorably when compared to their counterparts in the community. There are subtle but important differences between reporters and community members in the extent of the perceived low literacy and educational achievement in reporters, the drivers of this inequality and the consequences of same.

Both reporters and community show a high awareness of the lower educational levels of reporters but with young reporters in particularly more emphatically emphasizing the lower achievement: 91.6% of reporters aged 18-30 years stated that reporters have lower education than community members compared to 85.5% of counterparts in the community. Across reporters and the community the older the respondent the positive perceptions of educational attainment of reporters improve.

A majority of 91.4% of reporters and 81.2% of community members identify that it is a problem when reporters and community have unequal educational attainment. Both reporter and community emphasize to a similar degree (i) low literacy; (ii) inability to attain employment and look after one's family; (iii) inability to participate in life and the community s the top three problems. Differences arise further down the frequency of responses where 4.9% of reporters identify that low educational achievement leads to poverty and reporters becoming beggars in comparison to 0.0% of community members. Reporters do not identify that the lower education leads to crime or civil disturbance where 2.5% of community members do.⁴ Similarly 0.3% of reporters identify that low educational achievement is a barrier to

⁴ During field work reporters claimed the complete opposite and stated that the conditionality of their amnesty (that they can only receive once) and the risk that civil disturbance could constitute a reason to lose their amnesty

marriage opportunities compared to 6.6% of community members who believe it does affect reporters' prospects for marriage. Of the community 2.5% also believe that it increases the marginalization or stigmatization of reporters where 0.0% of reporters identify this is an issue.

1.5 Summary

Conflict produces social disintegration including the fragmentation of family, communities and the broader society. A prerequisite of post-conflict recovery and a stated goal of the Ugandan DDR process since the creation Amnesty Act is social reintegration and as part of this those units formerly fragmented must be made whole again and norms and processes resumed and cemented. For reporters the challenges include re-entering fragmented units such as the family and the community and over time to be accepted there. They also include adopting and adhering to the accepted norms of the group and developing acceptance and social capital by being included in the accepted structures of the community (such as by being married and having a family) and contributing to the economic well-being of the community and not becoming dependents on social safety nets severely compromised by the legacy of conflict.

There is the disintegration of community ties leading to fragmentation. There is the clear break between combatant and non-combatant groups, in terms of who belongs or is considered a member of each community. Social disintegration affects all members of a community during wartime. Community members are forced to choose which faction they support and whether they will fight or not. Men often join the ranks of one fighting faction or another. This leads to the loss of fathers, husbands, and community leaders in many villages. Individuals may choose to break these social ties by joining a warring faction, or they may be forced to break these ties through forced recruitment into armed factions. The end result is the same: alienation from the community and the inability to look to the community for help. Combatants who commit atrocities against members of their communities strike the most violent blow to social unity, and these combatants are quickly ostracized from their communities. These forces divide communities along chosen allegiances.

The comparative analysis shows that reporters and community members largely share an understanding of the barriers faced by reporters to becoming contributing members of the community. There is a shared understanding that reporters are disadvantaged by educational and skills achievements and that such disadvantage can produce major barriers to reporters' full reintegration back into the community. It is hugely positive that only a very small percentage of the community appears to perceive reporters and their disadvantage as risk of criminality. Possibly because of the floor in the development in northern Uganda and the pervasive nature of development challenges rather than strictly DDR challenges, there appears to be an acceptance of reporters and reporters with the community share similar economic and livelihood challenges.

Reporters face challenges getting married creating the basic social unit for reintegration: the family and female reporters are particularly at risk of exclusion. Females are in poorer health and so face a more significant barrier to becoming productive.

Reporters require additional support and training to become contributing members to the economic wellbeing of the community and it is significant that female reporters are the only group receiving more intervention (in this case training) than their counterparts in the community. Part of this can be explained by the fact that socio-economic opportunities in the north of Uganda in particular are achieved through government programs that target both reporter and community member but still it would be expected

certificates and so reporters were unlikely to be involved in any civil protest. Staff at some AC offices in the north of Uganda suggested though that young reporters have been involved in recent rioting around the march to work protests.

that reporters would receive additional support to compensate for lower literacy, training and educational attainment.

It is already evident in the analysis of reporter statistics that female reporters are a particularly vulnerable sub-group. While this is not unexpected from the analysis of demographics the key challenges to female reporters are:

(i) **Health as a barrier to reintegration:** there is a higher percentage of female reporters than male who identify as chronically ill (17.4% of females in comparison to 8.4% of males). There is also a higher percentage of female reporters in treatment for psycho-social problems (2.5% in comparison to 0.5% of males). Other ill health issues - both psychological and physiological - have a correlation across genders including health problems as a result of torture or beatings during conflict (0.6% of females and 0.7% of males).

(ii) **Accessing marriage and the family unit as a barrier to reintegration:** female reporters are significantly less likely to be married than male reporters. Female reporters are more likely to be married to a male reporter than a male reporter is to be married to a female reporter. Also, for those whose marriages have broken down 39.5% of female reporters had been married to a reporter and 8.0% of male reporters had been married to a reporter. Furthermore for female reporters 26.1% indicated that the divorce was in some part caused by them being a reporter and 41.2% of male reporters indicated that it did.

(iii) **Literacy as a barrier to reintegration:** Female reporters have a high illiteracy rate: 59.8% of female reporters cannot read or write in comparison to 29.2% of male reporters. The highest illiteracy rates are in the age brackets 18 – 30 year and over 40 years which are 38.3% and 39% of reporters respectively.

2. Housing, General Security, Land, Livestock and Food Security

Following is an examination of: (i) the dwellings occupied by reporters including pertinent issues such as ownership and land tenure; (ii) safety and security including pertinent issues such as prevalence of small arms and perceived safety, and (iii) land usage and food security including pertinent issues such as access to communal lands and capacity to cultivate sufficient food.

Table A7. Comparative degree to which area of residence is war affected (combined)

How much was the area you currently live in affected by the fighting or rebel group?	Reporter	Community	Total
More than other areas	49.6%	51.9%	50.3%
Same as other areas	34.6%	27.1%	32.3%
Less than other areas	15.8%	21.0%	17.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	405	181	586

Regarding security, a litmus test of the reliability of the indicators is the extent to which there was agreement between the responses by reporters to security related questions and those by the respective community to the same. Correspondence indicates reliability. As seen above (table A7) there is strong correspondence between reporter and community.

2.1 Dwelling, living conditions and land security

The majority of reporters live with their families who they left behind when they entered their respective rebel groups (56.0%). Furthermore 26.5% live with family but not the same as the one before the conflict, 16.2% with a partner or spouse and 1.2% live alone.

Table A8. With whom reporters live (by armed group)

Who do you live with?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Alone	1.9%	.6%	.0%	2.3%
With partner	21.6%	15.2%	14.3%	.0%
With same family as before the conflict	58.6%	50.0%	57.1%	62.8%
With family but different to that from before the conflict	17.9%	34.2%	28.6%	34.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	162	158	35	43

The majority of reporters, 74.3%, live in a hut, 14.2% in a structure made of mud or daub and wattle and 9.8% live in a permanent house or flat. Much of this is because of the geographic location of the reporter. On the lower ratings 1.2% of the respondents live in a semi-permanent house with 0.5% squatting or living under sheeting. For these dwellings there are various ownership models. It was found that 60.4% of reporters own their dwelling and 7.5% identify that their partner or spouse own it. A further 16.0% identify that the family they live with (mainly their parents) own the property with 6.0% identifying that their dwelling is owned by a non-family member and 5.4% by a family member. A very small percentage identifies that their dwelling is owned by an institution such as a religious congregation or the government (0.3%); is allocated land on which they can build (0.2%), and owned by a landlord (0.7%). When cross tabulated with marital status it is revealed that self ownership rates are as follows: married monogamous (69.0%); married polygamous (73.0%); cohabiting (70.8%); divorced (50.0%); separated (46.2%); widowed (64.7%); single child never married (33.3%) and single adult never married (23.6%)

Table A9. Type of housing (by district)

	Reporter						
	Kampala	Arua	Gulu	Central	Kasese	Kitgum	Mbale
Hut	.0%	84.0%	85.7%	.0%	4.8%	91.8%	76.3%
Mud or daub and wattle	21.4%	14.8%	4.8%	37.5%	57.1%	5.5%	.0%
Squatter - sheeting	.0%	.6%	4.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Permanent house or flat	78.6%	.0%	4.8%	62.5%	33.3%	2.1%	18.4%
Semi-permanent house	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	4.8%	.7%	5.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	14	162	21	8	21	146	38

When analyzed by armed group and bearing in mind how geographic location influences type of dwelling, 90.9% of LRA live in a hut compared to 82.5% of WNBFB, 2.9% of ADF and 76.7% of UNRFB reporters. 42.2% of ADF reporters compared to 5.5% of LRA, 15.2% of WNBFB and 4.7% of UNRFB reporters live in mud or daub and wattle dwellings. A further 54.3% of ADF compared to 2.4% of LRA; 1.3% of WNBFB and 14.0% of UNRFB live in a permanent house or flat. 0.6 % of LRA and 0.6% of ADF are squatting.

The highest self-ownership per armed group is the WNBFB reporters of whom 80.8% own their property, compared to 41.2% of LRA reporters, 34.3% of ADF reporters and 72.1% of UNRFB. A further 5.1% and 3.2% of the WNBFB reporters live in property owned by their partners or in joint ownership respectively compared to 9.1% and 1.2% of LRA; 2.9% and 0.0% of ADF; 14.0% and 9.3% of UNRFB reporters. 10.9% of LRA live in a property owned by relatives compared to 1.3% of WNBFB; 11.4% of ADF and 0.0% of UNRFB reporters.

The study found that 75.8% of reporters identify that their dwelling has secure tenure. Analyzed by age and gender there is similarity in data across age and gender categories in line with the average with reporters aged 31-40 years peaking at 81.9%. Differences between male and female reporters are negligible: 15.2% of female reporters identify that their property has more secure tenure than that of their neighbors compared with 14.0% of males. Similarly 72.7% of female reporters compared to 78.9% of male reporters identify that the tenure is as secure as that of their neighbors. Female reporters are slightly more likely to identify that their land tenure is less secure than that of their neighbors: 12.1% compared to 7.0% of male reporters. 16.4% of disabled reporters identify that their tenure is more secure, 77.6% that it is as secure and 6.0% that it is less secure. Of LRA reporters 75.0% indicate that they have the same security of tenure as their neighbors compared to 80.1% of WNBFB; 63.3% of ADF, and 88.4% of UNRFB reporters. A further 6.9% of LRA identify that it is less secure compared to 9.0% of WNBFB; 6.7% of ADF and 11.6% of UNRFB reporters.

Table A10. Comparative rating of living conditions (by armed group)

How do you rate this living situation to the one you had after you went through the Amnesty Commission package?		
	Mean	N
LRA	1.41	98
UNRFB	1.48	33
ADF	1.80	30
WNBFB	2.06	85
<i>Key: closer to 3 implies worse, closer to 1 implies best</i>		

Reporters tend to perceive their living situation as worse than that of their neighbors: 48.1% of female reporters rate it so, as do 55.6% of male reporters and 65.7% of disabled reporters. The negative perception is consistent across age groups (as is to a large part the neutral and positive perceptions) but

slightly highest in those over 40 years of age (56.7%). It was found that 38.5% of female reporters, 31.4% of male reporters and 25.7% of disabled reporters identify their living situation as comparable (the same) as that of their neighbors. Furthermore 13.5% of female reporters identify that their situation is better than that of their neighbors compared to 13.1% of males and 8.6% of disabled reporters.

When reflecting on their current situation as compared to the one immediately after spontaneous self-demobilization or formal amnesty 31.9% state it is better, 36.0 that it is the same and 32.1% that it is worse. There is no significant difference between female and male respondents. When asked to compare it to the situation post-reinsertion reporters identify as follows: 55.6% of female reporters identified that it was better, 33.3% that it was the same and 11.1% that it was worse. The study found that 40.7% of males stated that it was better, 43.4% that it was the same and 15.9% that it was worse. Of disabled reporters 48.0% identified that it was better, 36.0 that it was the same and 16.0 that it was worse. While the negative perceptions were constant across age categories in the low teens, positive perceptions varied strongly. In the 18-30 year old category Reporters tend to view their situation as better (59.6%) compared to 43.9% of 31-40 year olds and 30.5% of over 40 year olds. Most over 40 year olds view their situation as the same as immediately post-reinsertion (53.7% compared to 27.3% of 18-30 year olds and 42.1% of 31-40 year olds.

Using mean score when analyzed by armed group WNBF are the group doing worst, then the ADF reporters, UNRF reporters and LRA reporters. When analyzed across armed groups and by age it is evident that LRA reporters are performing best since receipt of reinsertion assistance.

2.2 Safety and security

In the design and administration of the survey questions pertaining to safety and security were included in the housing section so as to encourage respondents to answer the questions honestly. Following is the analysis of the responses. Female and male reporters identify that the area in which they currently live was affected by the conflict more than other areas (51.0% and 49.2% respectively). The similar percentages persist in those who rate it the same as other areas (35.6% and 34.2% respectively) and less than other areas (13.5% and 16.6%). Younger reporters tend to identify the areas as worse off with 57.1% of the 18 - 30 category doing so, and 36.4% as the same and 6.5% as less than other areas. Older reporters in the over 40 years category follow a similar division: 50.0% identify the area in which they currently live as more affected by conflict than other areas, 30.7% as equally and 19.3% as less. Disabled reporters repeat a similar division. The middle age group is where it differs with it divided equally (37.8%) between more than other areas and the same, and with 24.5% identifying less than other areas.

Analyzed by armed group, 52.8% of LRA; 47.1% of WNBF; 25.7% of ADF and 62.8% of UNRF reporters identify that the area in which they currently live has been more affected by fighting or rebel activities than other areas. A further 5.0% of LRA; 19.7% of WNBF; 60.0% of ADF and 4.7% say it has been less affected. The high response rate for ADF reporters stating that their area was less affected may reflect their location largely in urban centre to which they have migrated.

Despite the degree to which reporters believe their area to be particularly conflict affected 85.0% of reporters feel safe where they live. Also, 7.6% feel neither safe nor unsafe and 6.6% feel unsafe. Drilling down into these responses the following is presented.

Table A11. Feeling of safety (by demographics)

How safe do you feel in the area you live?	Reporter					
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter
Safe	85.0%	88.5%	81.5%	86.0%	90.7%	91.4%
Neither safe nor unsafe	8.8%	3.8%	8.3%	7.0%	7.3%	5.7%
Unsafe	6.2%	7.7%	10.2%	7.0%	2.0%	2.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	306	104	157	100	150	70

As can be seen there is uniformly positive assessment of personal safety particularly from female reporters. Feelings of personal safety increase with the age category of reporters which would appear contradictory to the tendency for older members of the community to be more vulnerable. Young reporters feel less safe which appears contradictory to the general perception of 18-30 year olds full bravado and strength. However, as will be discussed this corresponds with the feelings of personal safety in the community. Also when compared against data on land ownership and food security as well as the trauma of conflict and an uncertain future (at least in the context of an economic future) the uncertainty of young reporters could be more readily understood.

Analyzed by armed group, LRA, WNBF and UNRF return a high percentage feeling safe: 81.8%; 93.7% and 95.3% respectively. 68.6% of ADF return that they feel safe compared with 17.1% neither safe nor unsafe, and 14.3% unsafe. The percentage of ADF stating they are unsafe is the highest of any group: 9.7%; 1.3% and 2.3% of LRA, WNBF and UNRF reporters respectively say they feel unsafe.

Table A12. Cross-tabulation of safety, peace and security

		Time between leaving the bush and formal demobilization						
		0 years	1-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	Total
How much was the area you currently live in affected by the fighting or rebel group?	More than other areas	33.3%	43.5%	57.4%	51.8%	68.2%	55.6%	49.5%
	Same as other areas	48.3%	42.0%	25.0%	30.1%	31.8%	33.3%	34.3%
	Less than other areas	18.3%	14.5%	17.6%	18.1%	.0%	11.1%	16.2%
How safe do you feel in the area you live?	Safe	77.4%	78.6%	80.9%	92.9%	95.5%	77.8%	85.7%
	Neither safe nor unsafe	9.7%	12.9%	10.3%	4.2%	4.5%	11.1%	7.8%
	Unsafe	12.9%	8.6%	8.8%	3.0%	.0%	11.1%	6.5%
Do you feel having reporters in your area increases or decreases the safety in the area you live?	Increase	45.9%	49.3%	41.2%	56.0%	59.1%	55.6%	50.9%
	Neither increase or decrease	42.6%	40.6%	38.2%	27.7%	31.8%	33.3%	34.4%
	Decrease	11.5%	10.1%	20.6%	16.3%	9.1%	11.1%	14.7%
How often do you hear gunshots in the area you live?	Always	3.2%	1.4%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
	Often	.0%	2.9%	1.5%	.0%	.0%	11.1%	1.0%
	Seldom	9.7%	17.4%	14.7%	9.5%	18.2%	11.1%	12.3%
	Never	87.1%	78.3%	80.9%	90.5%	81.8%	77.8%	85.4%
If you and someone else in the area you live were to have a serious argument, that is, with the potential of violent confrontation, would you be able to resolve the disagreement without resorting to physical violence?	Definitely yes	64.5%	64.3%	76.5%	78.0%	90.9%	88.9%	74.2%
	Maybe yes	11.3%	14.3%	17.6%	11.9%	.0%	11.1%	12.5%
	Maybe no	3.2%	1.4%	1.5%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
	Definitely no	21.0%	20.0%	4.4%	8.9%	9.1%	.0%	11.8%
What is the likelihood that	Likely	11.7%	26.9%	28.8%	11.5%	.0%	11.1%	16.6%

	Neither likely or unlikely	45.0%	35.8%	27.3%	16.7%	4.5%	11.1%	25.5%
	Unlikely	43.3%	37.3%	43.9%	71.8%	95.5%	77.8%	57.9%

Cross-tabulating feedback from reporters on safety and security there are clear trends indicating that as time passes, the proportion of respondents feeling safe increase (as indicated by the responses to the question: “how safe do you feel in the area you live?”). In other words, time is essential to improve the feelings of safety of the reporters. Responses to the question: “do you feel having reporters in your area increases or decreases the safety in the area you live?” also clearly identify that as time passes the proportion of the reporter sample that feel safe is improving (is getting larger). The responses to the question probing the likelihood to resort to violence to settle a disagreement again clearly indicates that as time out of the bush increases, the potential for a tense argument to turn to violence decreases. Finally, as time passes there is an increase in the belief that conflict will not resume however, there is an unusual spike in those who demobilized 15-19 years ago (largely WNBFB and UNRF reporters).

When asked if reporters specially increase or decrease safety in the area in which respondents live, 41.2% of female reporters respond that they increase security in comparison to 53.3% of male reporters and 48.6% of disabled reporters. Reporters age 31-40 years show the highest percentage (55.0%) who identify that reporters increase the safety in an area. Of those who feel reporters have the opposite affect and decrease security the two most prominent groups are female reporters (17.6%) and older reporters in the over 40 year old category (16.9%). Given the prevalence of GBV and the legacy of violence endured by female reporters it is understandable that they perceive negative effects on security by the presence of reporters. Across armed groups there is no real difference of perception with between 45% and 56% (rounded) of each group stating that reporters increase safety.

To compound the findings that reporters perceive a very low security threat, firearm penetration is also low based on feedback of reporters.⁵ On average 84.6% of reporters identify that they never hear gunshots where they live. This is composed of: 79.6% of female reporters; 86.3% of males and 87.1% of disabled reporters. The age categories are similarly high: all are between 83.0% and 85.0%. Those who responded that they seldom hear gunshots (13.2%) compose most of the remaining portion of reporters in all categories: 18.4% of female reporters; 11.4% of male reporters. Respondents residing in permanent houses or flats (27.6% of seldom hear gunshots) have a slightly higher prevalence of hearing gunshots than respondents in other housing types. Similarly there is a slightly elevated frequency of hearing gunshots in the district capitals than in other places as defined by land use.

When analyzed by armed group ADF reporters who are mainly peri-urban in their location hear gunshots most frequently (nearly twice as frequently as LRA and WNBFB). Given their lack of access to livestock, land and agricultural produce the frequency is likely corresponding with the peri-urban location around Central of much of the sample. Most WNBFB reporters never hear gunshots (91.1%) compared with 85.4% of LRA; 65.7% of ADF and 74.4% of UNRF reporters.

It was found that 12.4% of reporters identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument they would resort to physical violence to resolve the conflict. Female reporters are more likely to resort to violence with 14.4% stating they would be unable to resolve a serious disagreement without resorting to violence compared to 11.8% of men. The age category most likely to resort to violence is the 18-30 year old (17.8%) as compared to 7.0% for 31-40 year olds and 10.7% for over 40 year olds. 10% of disabled reporters identify that they would resort to violence.

⁵ A substantial amount of firearms and ammunition was destroyed in Uganda during May 2006. The Ugandan police, UPDF with the NFP, UNDP and SaferAfrica decommissioned 60,000 firearms and in November of the same year 3,000 tons of ammunition. <http://UNVUganda.org> 05 October 2011. This would have substantially used up the stock of arms in circulation prior to demobilizations.

LRA reporters are most likely to resort to violence: 19.4% identify that they would be unable to resolve a serious dispute without resorting to violence compared to 8.9% of WNBFB; 0.0% of ADF, and 11.6% of UNRFB reporters.

When asked about a potential future return to conflict reporters were asked to speak generally, not about resumption in their specific region. Looking to the future a majority of reporters identify that return to conflict is unlikely: 54.6% of female reporters, 59.7% of male reporters and 50.7% of disabled reporters identify it so. Analyzed across armed groups the two armed groups that believe war is likely are the ADF and LRA reporters. Of ADF males 60% believe a return to war is likely as do 25% of ADF females and 26.7% of LRA females. This contrasts with 11.6% of WNBFB and 2.4% of UNRFB reporters. The two armed groups that believe a resumption of war is unlikely are the UNRFB and WNBFB: 74% and 92.9% respectively believe a resumption is unlikely. This contrasts with only 41.9% of the LRA and 30.3% of the ADF.

In summary: (i) approximately half of all reporters identify their area of residence as more conflict affected than others with approximately and additional third stating that it is as badly affected as other areas of which they are aware. More young reporters will identify that their areas is more affected. (ii) the significant majority of reporters feel safe where they live however, younger reporters are more likely to feel unsafe. (iii) female reporters are the group most likely to feel that reporters contribute to safety problems in their area. (iv) female reporters are also more likely to resort to violence to resolve an argument than males. (v) instances of firearm usage and firearms penetration are very low; (vi) of all reporters disabled reporters are most pessimistic about a return to national conflict in the future.

2.3 Land usage and food security

Land ownership structures differ in Uganda. Where the majority of the sample is taken from, traditionally land is organized around clans. Land is generally referred to as “family land” and not to land that is privately owned. Consequently even where there may be no titles or ownership papers there can still be safety of tenure because of the clan structure. For example, during the fieldwork for the study many reporters in Kitgum who identified themselves as landowners had no title deeds but availed of the security of tenure given by the clan system. The study finds that there is a higher title deed ownership of land by reporters (40.7%) than by community (31.9%). reporters have comparatively low access to communal land (28.5%) when compared to the community (50.0%) however a greater proportion of reporters have no access to land (10.2% composed of ADF) compared to 6.0% of community. In fact ADF 42.9% of ADF reporters have no access to land where they live (compared to 9.1% of the LRA and 7.6% of WNBFB reporters) they also have very limited access to land in another area, which someone else may be looking after for them. It was found that 61.8% of LRA hold title deeds for the land they own compared with 28.5% of the WNBFB; 23.3% of the UNRFB and 14.3% of the ADF reporters.

The study identified how 44.2% of female reporters identify that they have a title deed or proof of ownership for their own land as do 39.5% of male reporters and 40% of disabled reporters. The highest level of documented ownership is young reporters 58.6% with 29.0% of 31-40 year olds and 30.0% of over 40s having documented ownership.

Examining access to any land in order to grow food low percentages of reporters identified that they had no access to land but of that group females were the highest percentage: 10.6% of female reporters; 7.8% of men and 1.4% of disabled reporters. The age group most commonly without access to land were in the 31 - 40 years old category of whom 14.0% did not have access to land for growing food.

Table A13. Access to land near place of residence (by armed group)

Do you currently have access to land in the area you live where you currently grow food?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
No access to land where I live	7.3%	5.1%	42.9%	.0%
Yes, own land - title deed or papers as proof	61.8%	28.5%	14.3%	23.3%
Yes, access to communal land	15.2%	39.2%	5.7%	60.5%
Yes, rent or lease privately owned land	3.0%	5.7%	25.7%	4.7%
Other	.6%	1.9%	.0%	2.3%
Yes, family land	9.1%	11.4%	11.4%	2.3%
Yes, own land - no title deed	.0%	4.4%	.0%	4.7%
Yes own land but communal land	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%
No access to land here but access somewhere else	1.8%	2.5%	.0%	.0%
Offered by well wishers	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Community land, ancestral	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Loaned land, given use	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%
Too old, poor health	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	165	158	35	43

The study found that 26.9% and 28.4% of female and male reporters have access to communal land and 3.8% and 11.1% have access to family land. A small proportion rent land: 8.7% of female reporters and 6.2% while 2.3% of male reporters have no local access but have access to land outside their immediate area. 0.0% of reporters are squatters. It was found that 22.6% of female reporters 20.0% of male reporters have access to land in another area which is being tended by another and on which they grow food. This land is urban located family land (2.2% female reporters, 0.7% male reporters); rural located non-family (4.3% female reporters, 6.1% male reporters); urban located non-family land (1.1% male reporters only); some combination of these categories (1.1% female reporters, 0.4% male reporters). 58.2% of reporters sell some of the produce they grow on their land (57.9% of female reporters and 58.3% of male reporters).

Table A14. Access to land away from place of residence (by armed group)

Do you have access to land in another area, which someone else is looking after on your behalf where you currently grow food?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes, family land – rural	20.4%	24.0%	15.8%	14.0%
Yes, family land – urban	.0%	2.7%	.0%	.0%
Yes, non-family land – rural	2.6%	8.0%	.0%	11.6%
Yes, non-family land – urban	.0%	.7%	.0%	4.7%
Yes combination of above	.7%	.7%	.0%	.0%
No	76.3%	64.0%	84.2%	69.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	152	150	19	43

Reporters were surveyed on changes to land access to ascertain the degree of regulated land division (through modalities such as inheritance, division amongst children or giving land as a dowry) and the degree of unregulated division primarily through land grabbing. Most reliable is the response by those reporters identifying that they have less land because one could assume that despite no reporter saying that they grabbed land on return some percentage are likely to have done so. 26.5% of female reporters and 26.4% of male reporters identified that they had less arable land now for planting and harvesting than in 2009. When asked to explain why the majority of female and male reporters, 42.3% and 53.8% respectively identified that their land had undergone regulated division however it is not clear if this is related to them being reporters. Loss of land due the encroachment of urban development was identified

as the cause by 15.4% of female reporters and 10.3% of male reporters. 15.4% of females and 16.7% of males stated that they had lost land due to unregulated division of lands. Notably, female reporters have lost land because land was sold by their now late husband. The age group most affected by land grabbing is 18 – 30 year olds: 55.2% relate that they have lost land due to unregulated division, compared to 4.0% of 31-40 year olds and 0.0% of over reporters in the over-40 year old category. Again, it is not clear if this is related to them being reporters.

Analyzed by armed group 73.9% of LRA reporters, 51.6% of WNBF reporters; 82.9% of ADF reporters and 54.8% of UNRF reporters state they have the same amount of arable land for planting and harvesting in comparison to two years previously. That study documents how 17.8% of LRA reporters state they have less and 8.3% that they have more compared with 36.6% and 11.8% of WNBF reporters; 8.6% and 8.6% of ADF reporters, and 35.7% and 9.5% of UNRF. Examining the ADF responses it is likely that largely the reporters have the same low level of suitable land for agricultural production as two years ago so when ADF reporters identify a “same as before” response they are confirming that as before when they had little to no land, they still have little to no land.

A small percentage of reporters have more arable land than two years previously: 12.2% of female reporters and 9.7% of male reporters. For female reporter the main reasons are: (i) through marriage (36.4%); (ii) additional land had been purchased by a household member for investment, and (iii) equally at 9.1% of respondents (a) land was vacated by IDPs who occupied it during the conflict; (b) clan parceled out communal land; (c) relatives or father gifted land; (d) migration. For male reporters the main reason is inheritance (31.0%) followed by land purchased for commercial production (13.8%); land purchased for subsistence of family (13.8%); land purchased by another household member for investment (10.3%) and land vacated by IDPs (6.9%).

For those reporters who have increased access to arable land LRA reporters identify the following top three reasons: (i) through marriage (41.7%); (ii) inheritance (16.7%), and (iii) recent purchase of land by household member for investment (16.7%). For WNBF reporters the top three are: (i) inheritance (50.0%); (ii) purchased with commercial motivation (22.2%); (iii) land obtained for children’s future subsistence agriculture, and land acquired after previous people left it to return to their homes (both 11.1%). For ADF the reasons are: (i) clan parceled out land (33.3%); (ii) relatives or father gave me land (33.3%); (iii) agriculture is doing well (33.3%). For UNRF reporters the reasons are: (i) land obtained for children’s future subsistence agriculture (50.0%), and (ii) recent purchase of land by household member for investment (50.0%).

52.7% of reporter households have livestock (51.9% of female reporters and 52.9% of male reporters and 42.9% of reporters). The majority of reporters have experienced increases in their stock in the last two years: 55.6% of female reporters and 64.4% of male reporters.

Reporters over 40 years of age are least likely not to have livestock (41.3%) in comparison to 18-30 year olds and 31-40 year olds 50.3% and 52% respectively do not have livestock in their households. The most common reason given by reporters for their household not having livestock is poverty: insufficient resources (53.5% composed of 53.2% female reporters and 53.6% male reporters). The next two most frequent reasons given are: (i) lack of access to suitable land/lack of space for livestock (23.2% composed of 21.3% of female reporters and 23.9% of male reporters), and (i) experiences of crime/livestock stolen (composed of 14.9% of female reporters and 7.2% of male reporters). Disabled reporters are most likely to have experienced crime (17.9%) as a reason and 18-30 year olds are most likely to identify poverty as the cause (64.9% of 18-30 year olds).

To summarize (i) that reporters have high levels of documented ownership of land, particularly young reporters; (ii) that female reporters consistently have the most limitation on access to (a) private land, and

(b) communal land; (iii) approximately a quarter of all reporters have lost land and 15 – 16 percent of reporters have lost land because of unregulated division; (iv) more than half of young reporters have been negatively affected by land grabbing; (v) of those who have lost land disabled reporters have the highest exposure to losing land through crime.

2.3.1 Hunger

The study found that 21.6% of reporters live in a household where some members often go hungry, 2.7% always go hungry. Female reporters are most prone to hunger: 3.8% of female reporters are in a household where someone always goes hungry; 32.7% in a household where someone often goes hungry and 41.3% in a household where seldom someone goes hungry. This compares to male reporters where the same breakdown is 2.3%; 17.8% and 46.7%. Only 22.0% of female reporters are in a household where someone never goes hungry. There are similar percentages across age groups and the disabled reporters for households where someone always or someone often goes hungry but in the seldom category reporters in the over 40 years old category have the highest rate of hunger (52.0%) as compared to 44.0% (31 – 40 year olds) and 39.5% (18 – 30 year olds). These responses are confirmed when the mean score is analyzed to reveal that female reporters go hungry most frequently of all categories as do reporters over the age of 40.

Analyzed by armed group the findings are as follows:

Table A15. Hunger (by armed group)

How frequently do people in your household go hungry?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Always	2.4%	3.2%	.0%	4.7%
Often	22.4%	17.9%	31.4%	23.3%
Seldom	35.8%	54.5%	51.4%	41.9%
Never	39.4%	24.4%	17.1%	30.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	165	156	35	43

During the course of fieldwork reporters identified that with the reduction in NGOs giving food support the option for supplementing household nutrition had decreased. Confirming this, the survey results identified that 87.5% of female reporters and 89.4% of males lived in household where charitable food parcels were never received. With limited options it is not surprising that some reporters hustle or beg for food, particularly female reporters. Also, during field work reporters were very reluctant to talk about begging, hustling or scavenging but the survey results reveal the following. Female reporters live in households where someone always hustles or begs for food (1.0%); often does so (13.7%) and seldom does so (22.5%) in comparison to male reporters where the respectively the results are: 2.6%; 6.6% 14.5%. reporters over 40 years of age are most often part of households where begging is most frequent (3.4% report that someone always begs or hustles) but 9.7% and 9.1% if young reporters and those aged 31 -40 years respectively are part of households where hustling and begging happens often. Less than 2% of all reporters scavenges for food on a seldom basis. Approximately 98% state that in their household no one ever scavenges for food.

Table A16. Hustling and begging for food (by armed group)

How often do you or anyone in your household hustle or beg for food?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Always	.6%	4.4%	.0%	2.4%
Often	9.9%	7.0%	8.6%	9.5%
Seldom	19.9%	13.3%	20.0%	14.3%
Never	69.6%	75.3%	71.4%	73.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	161	158	35	42

Analyzed by armed group it is reported that a very small portion of any armed group always or often queue to collect free food: 1.2% and 1.2% of LRA reporters; 0.6% and .6% of WNBFB reporters; 0.0% and 5.7% of ADF reporters and 2.3% and 0.0% of UNRF reporters respectively. Similarly a small portion of any armed group receives charitable food parcels always or often: 0.6% and 1.9% of LRA reporters; 1.3% and 0.0% of WNBFB reporters; 0.0% and 0.0% of ADF reporters and 2.3% and 0.0% of UNRF reporters respectively. The frequency of begging or hustling for food is low in all armed groups with similar rates across each group. Levels of scavenging or rummaging for food in garbage bins or dumps is also reported to be low: 98.2% of LRA reporters never do so (0.6% do so often and 1.2% seldom); 97.5% of WNBFB reporters never do so (0.6% do so often and 1.9% seldom); 100% of LRA reporters never do so, and 97.7% of UNRF reporters never do so (2.3% do so often).

Overall, nutrition or nourishment had tended to improve for around one third or all members of the armed groups. The study found that 38.6% of LRA reporters identify it has improved and 40.5% that it has stayed the same compared to 28.6% and 38.6% respectively of WNBFB reporters; 27.3% and 33.3% respectively of ADF reporters and 32.6% and 27.9% respectively of UNRF reporters.

2.4 Summary

Examining the housing, food security and safety aspects of reporter reintegration there are key general findings and specific findings relating to vulnerability of female reporters and the vulnerability of ADF reporters that is emerging in the analysis.

Reflecting the rural location of many respondents the majority of reporters live in a hut with very few in high risk structures such as living under sheeting. There are a variety of ownership models and 60.4% of reporters own their dwelling and 7.5% identify that their partner or spouse own it. 16.0% identify that the family they live with (mainly their parents) own the property with 6.0% identifying that their dwelling is owned by a non-family member and 5.4% by a family member. Consequently there is a high level of security of ownership including for female reporters. ADF reporters are the most vulnerable in terms of land ownership.

The pattern of ownership between reporter and community members corresponds. 61.7% of community members own their property; 7.8% identify that their spouse or partner owns it; 4.4% are joint owners and 17.8% live with family who own the property. Across comparable demographics in reporter and community samples there is similarity on security of tenure. This similarity reveals that reporters and community members broadly share the same property type, issues and land ownership dynamics indicating that in terms of land security there is parity.

Regarding the perception of war affectedness there is a similarity between reporter and community samples: 49.6% of reporters compared to 51.9% of community members identify that the area in which they currently live was more affected by the war than other areas. Similarly there is similarity between reporter and community perception of security: 85.9% of reporters identify their area as safe compared to 84.1% of community members, 6.6% of reporters identify it as unsafe compared to 9.3% of community members. Also, there is similarity across perceptions of the affect of having reporters resident in the area: 50.2% of reporters compared to 46.4% of community members state that having reporters in their areas increases the safety of the area, and 14.8% of reporters and 13.8% of community members that it decreases the safety. These perceptions are strong indicators of reintegration.

To compound the findings that reporters and community perceive a very low security threat, firearm penetration is also low based on feedback of reporters and community with both groups having the same perception. On average 84.6% of reporters identify that they never hear gunshots where they live

compared to 79.4% of community members. Reporters and community share a perception about the likelihood of a return to violence: 16.4% of reports say it is likely and 58.5% that it is unlikely compared to 17.8% and 62.6% of community members. This similarity is repeated across a demographic breakdown of responses from reporters and community members

Levels of hunger differ between reporter and community: reporters are twice as likely to go hungry often compared to community members. 21.6% of reporters live in a household where some members often go hungry compared to 11.6% of community members, and 2.7% always go hungry compared to 1.1% of community members. Similarly female reporters are far more prone to hunger than their counterparts in the community. 3.8% of female reporters are in a household where someone always goes hungry compared to 0.0% of female community members; 32.7% in a household where someone often goes hungry compared to 7.0% of community members and 41.3% in a household where seldom someone goes hungry compared to 63.2% of community members. This highlights the food insecurity of reporters and in particular households with female reporters.

Based on this analysis it is evident that reporters and community members are well integrated in terms of land ownership and security. Reporters however, continue to exhibit greater food insecurity than their counterparts in the community.

The ADF reporters are a group exhibiting traits of vulnerability that will be repeated throughout the analysis in this report.

(i) ADF reporters have comparably low rates of property ownership which may be partially due to being peri-urban located. Only 34.3% of ADF reporters self-own their property;

(ii) ADF reporters have the highest percentage rating their living situation as worse than that of their fellow community members

(iii) ADF reporters have the highest percentage feeling unsafe and ADF reporters hear gunshots most frequently (nearly twice as frequently as LRA and WNBF).

(iv) ADF reporters are most convinced of the likelihood of a return to violence. with 51.5% of ADF reporters identifying that it is likely that conflict will resume on a scale seen in the war and 30.3% of ADF reporters identifying that it is unlikely.

The finding from this is that the peri-urban based-ADF reporters are exhibiting strong signifiers of poverty and social exclusion.

3. Economic Issues and Migration

Following is an analysis of the economic reintegration of reporters.. The analysis offers a historical analysis of the economic status of reporters and charts degrees of success in achieving economic reintegration and economic stability, the two not necessarily being the same thing. Conventional wisdom is that economic reintegration is essential for peace and stability. However economic reintegration in Uganda and particularly in northern Uganda is contextualized by the severe development challenges posed to reporters and community members alike. Consequently when measuring and analyzing economic reintegration the consultants have taken care to focus on some barriers to economic participation that are uniquely experienced by reporters. This chapter should be read in conjunction with the chapter on economic issues in the community dynamics report in order to obtain a rounded understanding of the findings.⁶

3.1 Economic Status and History

It was found that 90.8% of reporters indicate that they are economically active. Also 66.2% of reporters are current self-employed in agriculture which corresponds with the high percentages of reporters with access to land and who own livestock. This 66.2% does not include those reporters who identified that they are supplementing income through subsistence activities (1.2%). 6.7% are self-employed in the services industry and 5.0% are training. Broken down by gender there is some similarity across genders with the 66.2% being including 63.4% of female reporters and 67.1% of males. 60.9% of disabled reporters are also self-employed in agriculture. In fact there is little difference by gender throughout the breakdown of occupations with the only difference being in studying or training where 2.0% of female reporters are so engaged compared to 6.0% of male reporters and in working in the home where 5.9% of female reporters are so engaged and 0.3% of males.

Table A17. Comparative economic status

Reporters	Employment status prior to the conflict	Employment status at formal demobilization with AC	Current employment status
Unemployed	6.1%	30.0%	9.2%
Employed working for employer, agriculture	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Employed working for employer, private sector	1.5%	1.2%	2.7%
Employed working for employer, public sector	2.9%	0.7%	1.7%
Self employed agriculture	38.6%	54.8%	66.2%
Self employed non agriculture –services	4.4%	3.7%	6.7%
Self employed non agriculture –retail	1.5%	0.5%	2.7%
Self employed non agriculture –manufacturing	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Hustle or involved in or reliant on the informal economy ie economically active in informal sector	0.5%	0.7%	1.0%
Supplementing income through subsistence activities	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%
Studying or Training	42.8%	5.5%	5.0%
Housewife or Working in the home	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%
Retired, but not economically active	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	407	403	402

⁶ Data for responses to section F.10 to section F.22 which are answered only by economically inactive reporters, disabled reporters, and women reporters were answered mainly by LRA. Consequently because it is not reliable to sub-divide the data by armed forces the analysis focuses on the overall totals in each of the three sections included in these responses.

The major differences in economic status now when compared to prior to the conflict is that prior to the conflict 38.6% of reporters were self-employed in agriculture and 42.8% were studying or training reflecting the 18-30 year old full sample. Other categories of economic activity remain largely the same save for small percentage point increases or decreases. As with the sample's current economic status there is similarity across genders and disability however the main difference is how prior to the conflict 46.1% of females were studying or in training compared to 41.6% of males. These statistics for education and training include 86.4% of 18 – 30 year olds in comparison to the 13.3% who are studying today. While reporters in the 18 – 30 age bracket are older now than before the conflict, in terms of economic activity the biggest missed opportunity is completing education and training and the at least partially attributable result of which is higher numbers in limited agricultural activities. The largest negative change concerns disabled reporters: prior to the conflict only 2.9% of disabled reporters were unemployed, the majority were studying or training (47.1%) or self-employed in agriculture (38.6%). This compares to now where 21.7% are unemployed; 4.3% are studying or in training, and 60.9% are self-employed in agriculture. Influencing this statistic is that most disabilities were acquired in combat.

When comparing the economic status of reporters at time of formal demobilization to now clear progress can be charted. Where 30.0% of reporters were unemployed when they were demobilized there are now 9.2%. At demobilization 54.8% were self employed in agriculture compared with 66.2% now. 3.7% were self employed in services compared to 6.7% now. There is parity across genders including in training and education where 4.9% of female reporters were studying at time of formal demobilization not at time of spontaneous self demobilization or formal amnesty compared to 5.6% of male reporters.

Applying an analysis by armed group the highest level of unemployment is among ADF reporters where 25.7% are unemployed compared to 12.7% of LRA reporters, 4.5% of WNBF reporters and 2.3% of the UNRF reporters. 58.2% of LRA reporters are self-employed agriculture, 75.8% of WNBF reporters, 28.6% of ADF reporters and 88.4% of UNRF reporters. Reflecting the urban location of many ADF reporters 22.9% of them are self-employed services compared to 5.7% of LRA reporters, 6.4% of WNBF reporters and 0.0% of UNRF reporters. 12.0% of LRA reporters are studying compared to 2.9% of ADF reporters and 0.0% of WNBF and UNRF reporters. Reflecting the gender balance of the sample but also returning a low percentage overall 2.5% of LRA are working in the home compared to 0.6% of WNBF; 2.9% of ADF and 2.3% of UNRF.

The major differences in employment status between prior to the conflict and now is in (i) unemployment levels particularly for the ADF reporters; (ii) self-employed in agriculture, and (iii) study and training. 11.8% of ADF reporters were unemployed prior to the conflict compared with 25.7% now. Similarly for the other groups: 3.7% of LRA reporters prior to the conflict compared to 12.7% now; 7.0% of WNBF compared to 4.5% now, and 2.3% of UNRF compared to 4.7% now. In unemployment the major negative change is for the ADF and the LRA with the unemployment rates for WNBF improving and for UNRF increasing but not to that much higher a percentage.

Prior to the conflict 14.1% of LRA reporters were self-employed in agriculture compared to 58.2% now. For the other armed groups there are also increases: for the WNBF from 64.6% to 75.8%; for ADF from 17.6% to 28.6%, and for UNRF reporters from 55.8 to 88.4%. The biggest decrease is in studying or training which is influenced by the changed age profile particularly of ADF and UNRF reporters where for LRA there is a decrease from 79.8% to 12.0%; for WNBF from 15.2% to 0.0%, for ADF from 23.5% to 2.9% and for UNRF from 23.3% to 0.0%.

Since demobilization unemployment rates for LRA reporters have reduced from 45.9% to 12.7%; WNBF 12.0% to 4.5% now; ADF 60.0% to 25.7% now and UNRF 11.6% to 4.7% now. The major employment changes come in self-employment in agriculture and the pattern reflect how the older reporters who had returned to their communities in the late 1990s and early 2000s had already established their employment

patterns prior to formal demobilization largely under the UgDRP. LRA self employment in agriculture changed from 36.5% at demobilization to 58.2%; WNBF from 75.3% to 15.8%; ADF from 20.0% to 28.6% and UNRF from 79.1% to 88.4%. There has been little change in numbers studying or in training apart from WNBF and UNRF reporters appearing to complete all education in which they were engaged.

The four main causes of unemployment for reporters as identified by reporters are: (i) health or disability constraints (26.5% including 26.3% of female and 26.5% of male reporters and 65.0% of disabled reporters); (ii) financial problems mainly no credit (13.2% including 26.3% of female reporters and 8.2% of male reporters); (iii) lack of marketable skills (13.2% including 10.5% of female reporters and 14.3% of male reporters); and (iv) lack of work opportunity (10.3% including 5.3% of female reporters and 12.2% of male reporters). Notably 5.3% of female reporters also identify lack of education as a cause compared to 0.0% of male reporters. In addition to health other barriers identified by disabled reporters are: financial problem mainly no credit (14.3%) and lack of marketable skills (5.0%). 50% of young reporters are in education and the rest encounter barriers in health (20.0%); marketable skills (10.0%), and lack of work opportunity (10.0%) compared to older reporters of whom 42.9% encounter barriers in health; 14.3% are retired and 14.3% encounter problems in marketable skills and lack of work opportunity.

Having returned to their communities over time 57.7% of reporters returned to their pre-conflict employment or type of work. There is close to parity between responses from female and male reporters (52.1% and 59.5% respectively). Across age categories young reporters are least likely to have returned to pre-conflict employment and this corresponds with the dramatic shift from study to agricultural work for young reporters and particularly LRA reporters: only 24.4% of reporters aged 18-30 did so and 31.2% of LRA reporters. This is compared to 54.3% of reporters aged 31-40 years and 78.1% of reporters over 40 years old as well as 75.3% of WNBF reporters; 39.1% of ADF reporters and 66.7% of UNRF reporters. 48.1% of disabled reporters return to pre-conflict employment or income generating opportunity. Prior to conflict 38% of 31-40 year olds were self-employed and now this is 67%.

Despite the relatively positive social reintegration and acceptance experiences of reporters as found in this study reporters were convinced they had a more difficult life than their fellow members in the community and fellow reporters. Regarding economic opportunities 78.7% of reporters are convinced they and their fellow reports find it harder to get employment than other community members. There is an even split across genders in this regard and age groups but young reporters are the most likely to agree (89.7%) approximately 10% -13% more than reporters in other age categories.

The main challenges identified by reporters are: (i) no or low qualifications (59.7%); (ii) stigma or negative attitudes towards reporters (17.6%), and (iii) lack of experience (9.9%) The inclusion by reporters of stigma as a challenge is interesting as it stigma is not a significant barrier encountered in social reintegration or in migration. Gender differences emerge where more female reporters believe lack of experience and fear of being captured, rejected, attacked and insulted than do male reporters: 14.3% and 8.6% respectively compared to 4.3% and 0.8% of males). Responses for disabled reporters largely correspond with the general statistics.

More reporters believe their economic situation will improve in the future than not (65.5% compared to 34.5%) with young reporters and so those of the LRA being most positive about the future: 70.4% of young reporters believe their situation will improve and 92.0% of LRA reporters. Female reporters are less positive than their male counterparts with 60.8% of females and 67.0% of males expressing the belief that things will improve.

Female and male reporters are quite different in their reasons why they believe things will improve in the future: Where they agree around the main drivers and where is near parity in response rates is: (i) improved agricultural productivity (30.0% of female reporters and 28.6% of male reporters), and (ii)

improved or expanding business such as customer base or running multiple business ventures (13.3% of female reporters and 11.5% of male reporters).

Where there is disparity is as follows: 5.0% of female reporters and 14.1% of male reporters identify that employment prospects due to studying, experience and training is a driver for their optimistic appraisal. Similarly 5.0% of female reporters identify improved productivity, getting more work and being focused on money saving as a reason compared to 14.1% of male reporters. 5.0% of female reporters identify government assistance compared to 1.0% of male reporters and 23.3% of female reporters identify hope as their reason for thinking things will improve, particularly hope for some form of assistance package compared to 8.9% of males. 21.4% of disabled reporters also identify hope for assistance package as a reason they are optimistic; 36.5% identify improved agricultural productivity and 16.5% improved productivity, getting more money, working hard and saving. Also noteworthy is that reporters do not attribute much importance in this respect to relative peace and security with only 3.3% of female and 4.7% of male reporters identifying it as a driver for improved economic conditions.

There is little similarity in responses when analyzed across armed groups: LRA reporters focus on: (i) improved employment prospects due to studying, experiences, training, planning on studying (23.8%); (ii) Improved agricultural productivity (33.3%), and (iii) personal attributes of respondents such as healthy, hard working, determined to become more productive (15.2%). WNBF reporters focus on: (i) personal hope (29.5%); (ii) improved agricultural productivity (22.7%), and (iii) improved productivity due more money, plan to work hard in the future, work in second job, prospects are improving. The ADF reporters focus on: (i) personal hope (42.9%), and (ii) improved or expanding business, customer base, multiple going concerns or business ventures, reinvested money (28.6%). UNRF reporters identify: (i) improved agricultural productivity; and (ii) personal hope (19.4%).

For reporters the two key threats to future economic productivity are: (i) lack of financial support or capital (32.3% including 27.8% of female reporters and 34.1% of male reporters and 18.2% of disabled reporters), and (ii) ill health or aging (27.8% of female reporters, and 20.5% of male reporters and 45.5% of disabled reporters).

3.2 Non-economically active reporters on employment issues

Of the respondents 9.2% of reporters are unemployed (comprising 11.9% of female and 8.3% of male reporters). Focusing on this group it was found that 36.0% of reporters rely on their family for cash contributions to alleviate their situation, 32.0% are directly supported by family; 12.0% beg for money and 4.0% rely on casual work and a future 4.0% borrow money. There are similar responses by female and male reporters: key areas of difference are 0.0% of female reporters steal food compared with 6.5% of male reporters and 5.3% of female reporters are assisted by spouse compared with 0.0% of male reporters.

LRA reports are most likely to rely on family cash contributions (53.3%) and being provided for by other members of the family (33.3%), a pattern that is somewhat repeated in the WNBF (22.2% and 44.4% respectively). ADF are more likely to resort begging (37.5%) with 12.5% relying on being provided for by other family members. UNRF reporters are provided for by other family members, work for others and sell surplus food or produce in equal percentages (33.3%) respectively. What this shows that LRA and WNBF reporters are more dependent upon family for support (a support pattern that is reproduced throughout this report); ADF reporters are in a more acute situation without recourse to the immediate family support network for economic support; and the UNRF more likely to self-sustain in order to bridge a gap in personal or household finances.

It was found that 67.5% of reporters believe that they find it more difficult than other people to find work (composed of 77.8% of female reporters and 64.5% of males). 53.4% of non-economically active reporters believe that being a reporter contributes to them not working, composed of 50.0% of female reporters and 55.9% of male reporters. In terms of armed group this represents 42.4% of LRA reporters (14 people); 66.7% of WNBFB reporters (8 people); 22.2% of ADF reporters (2 people), and 75.0% of UNRFB reporters (3 people).

To elaborate further, 63.6% of female reporters and 38.9% of male reporters believe it does so because as a reporter they have a lack of skills, education and expertise. 18.2% of female reporters and 33.3% of male reporters believe it does so because of their resulting poor health. 9.1% of female reporters and 22.2% of male reports believe it does so because as reporters they endure the negative consequences of a general fear of reporters and negative perception by prospective employers and the community.

When looking to the future, 27.8% of reporters identify that they have a good chance of securing employment; 27.8% that they have neither a good nor a bad chance and 44.4% that they have a poor chance. Responses are close to parity between female and male reporters.⁷

3.3 Women reporters on employment issues

It was found that 83.9% of non-economically active female reporters identify that they do not feel discriminated against in the workplace as a result of being a female reporter. The phrasing of this question means that the respondents are discussing discrimination on the basis of being a female reporter rather than female or reporter in isolation. When asked specifically if they feel discriminated on the ground of their gender 68.4% say they are not. The 31.6 % who responded positively includes 36.4% of 18-30 year olds; 66.7% of 31-40 year olds and 0.0% of those over 40 years of age. 25.0%.⁸ Across armed groups this includes 43.8% of active female WNBFB reporters; 28.6% of ADF, 28.6% of UNRFB and 8.0% of LRA.

Following relate to response only by female reporters who are working or are economically productive. 76.8% (that is 43 out of 56) of female reporters state they do not believe they are discriminated against in the workplace. Of the 23.2% who do 57.1% are aged 31-40 years and 29.2 are over 40 years. 18.2% are disabled. When asked if they feel discriminated against as a female, 23.2% replied that they did.⁹

Of all economically active female Reporters 36.4% stated they had considered joining together with other female employees to combine skills for some economic purpose including 10 reporters aged 18-30 years; 6 aged 31-40 years and 16 aged over 40 years. This would be in order to earn money to support the family and supplement income (37.0%); go build up our confidence including economic confidence which has been damaged by time in the bush (14.8%), and to be heard in economic and development debates and so access top development opportunities (11.1%).

⁷Of those who identified that they have a poor chance of securing employment in the future nine say that they are in poor physical health or are aged; four reporters say it is because they have no or low qualifications; three reporters say that they have no capital, and one each say that they must look after their family, that they need external assistance and that they are afraid. Percentages are not used as response rate is too low.

⁸ Two reporters each said: (i) everyone discriminates against them; (ii) their co-workers do, and (iii) male co-workers do. 1 each said: (i) all employers or bosses, and (ii) female employers and bosses. Percentages were not used as response rate is too low.

⁹ Half of reporters said discrimination was by women in the workplace; of the rest: that it was by all employees or bosses; male co-workers, and everyone, and or a combination of all co-workers; neighbours, and male employers or bosses. Percentages were not used as response rate is too low

3.4 Disabled reporters on employment issues

Following are responses by disabled reporters only. In total 70 disabled reporters were included in the survey. 23.1% of disabled reporters who are currently out of work believe they have been discriminated against including 12.5% of female reporters 27.8% of male reporters; 27.3% of reporters aged 18-30 years; 12.5% of reporters aged 31-40 years and 28.6% of reporters aged over 40 years. 66.7% of reporters believe all employers or bosses are discriminating against them.¹⁰ 33.3% believe it is everyone.

The study found that 19.4% of economically active reporters believe they are being discriminated against by virtue of being disabled including 16.7% of female reporters ; 21.1% of male reporters; 15.2% of reporters aged 18 – 30 years of age; 20.0% of those aged 31 – 40 years and 25.0% of those aged over 40 years. 57.1% of these reporters believe they are discriminated against by all employers or bosses; 14.3% each by male co-workers, and by all co-workers, and by everyone.¹¹ 30.6% believe they are being discriminated against by virtue of being a reporter including 23.1% of female reporters; 34.8% of male reporters; 27.8% of reporters aged 18-30 years; 25.0% of reporters aged between 31 and 40 years, and 44.4% of reporters aged over 40 years.

It was found that 37.3% of economically active reporters have considered joining up with other disabled reporters to combine skills for some economic purpose. This includes 40.0% of female reporters and 35.9% of male reporters. The main motives are to generate income (22.7%); to improve our lives generally (13.6%), and to improve chances of getting help for the GoU or NGOs (9.1%).¹²

3.5 Income, savings and access to credit

It was found that 40.4% of reporters are sole breadwinners, while 59.6% rely on others for assistance. Of these 59.6% the reporters earn a varying amount of household income (table A23). The sole breadwinners are composed on 30.7% of female reporters, 43.7% of male reporters and 33.3% of disabled reporters. The older the reporter the more likely they are to be the sole breadwinner: 25.8% of reporters aged 18-30 years are; 47.5% of those aged 31-40 years and 50.7% of those over 40 years old. These percentages closely mirror the percentage of LRA, WNBF and ADF reporters who are sole breadwinners. In addition 34.9% of UNRF identify in this manner also.

Table A18. Percentage of Household Income

Percentage of HHI	Percentage of reporters
1-20 percent	20.3%
21-40 percent	22.3%
41-60 percent	25.4%
61-80 percent	18.0%
81-100 percent	14.1%

Female and male reporters are proportioned with parity and in similarity to the overall percentages while disabled reporters are clustered evenly in the lower three HHI percentage ranges.

¹⁰ Including one female reporter; three male reporters and four disabled reporters, 100%, 66.6% and 66.6% of their respective samples for this question.

¹¹ One female reporter said by all co-workers; one female reporter said by everyone; three male reporters said by all employers or bosses and two male reporters said by male co-workers. Percentages were not used as response rate is too low

¹² While responses are low for a full gender analysis the nine female reporters were more evenly spread across motives and included more not-for-profit emphasis than males. For example, one female reporter identified that joining with other disabled and economically active reporters would enable better recognition as a group planning for a vocational school in their community.

All reporters surveyed considered their household income and concluded the following regarding their financial health after meeting household expenses each month (table A19).

Table A19. Comment on financial situation at end of the month

Reporter comment	Percentage of reporters
Usually have money left over	2.5%
Usually break-even	32.7%
Usually have to use past savings	6.5%
Rely on family money transfer	24.2%
Usually have to borrow	34.1%

It was found that 64.8% of the reporters do not make ends meet. This was similar to the community of which 67.9% did not managed to meet all their household expenses at the end of each month. Young reporters are more likely to fail to make ends meet (71.3%) compare dot 64.8% of those aged 31-40 and 59.2% of those aged over 40 years. Those employed in agriculture are least likely make ends meet (65.4%) most likely because many are subsistence farming, however this is less than the same category in the community (69.1%), however this is less than the same category in the community (69.1%). Of the 34.1% who have a shortfall, they are short each month by the following amounts (Table A20):

Table A20. Monthly shortfall in household finances

Shortage	Percentage of 34.1%
1-20 percent	25.9%
21-40 percent	22.3%
41-60 percent	20.1%
61-80 percent	22.3%
81-100%	9.5%

Of all reporter groups those living in peri-urban location are most likely to break even (51.4%). These reporters are self-employed in agriculture and are performing economically much better than those in rural settlements or isolated rural homesteads and whom are self-employed in the same manner. The likely scenario is that they have convenient access to local urban markets thus improving their ability to make ends meet.

In order to meet household expenses more reporters than not are forced to rely on external assistance than not: 24.2% of reporters rely on family money transfers and 34.1% rely on borrowing money. 6.5% use past savings to meet expenses. 32.7% break even at the end of every month and 2.5% have money left over after meeting household expenses. Female and male reporters are proportioned with parity and in similarity to the overall percentages as do disabled reporters. When examined by armed group the ADF and UNRF rely most on credit to meet household expenses: 51.7% and 55.8% respectively usually borrow each month compared to 23.7% of LRA and 33.6% of WNBFB – something which is reflected in responses to the question as to whether since receiving reinsertion packages if reporters have to borrow money to help meet daily needs. 31.5% of LRA reporters; 27.0% of WNBFB reporters; 55.2% of ADF reporters, and 74.4% reporters need to borrow to meet daily needs. Age is a factor increasing the likelihood with which reporters need to borrow to meet daily needs: 29.6% of 18-30 year olds; 44.1% of 31-40 years, and 47.3% of reporters aged over 40 years. 36.7% of disabled reporters do so also. 3.1% of LRA reporters, 2.1% of WNBFB reporters, 0.0% of WNBFB and 2.3% of UNRF reporters have money left over at the end of the month and 30.5%, 37.1%, 17.2% and 32.6% respectively usually break even. WNBFB reporters are most likely to use their past savings to meet household expenses (11.2%) and LRA reporters least likely (2.3%). LRA reporters are most likely to rely on family transfers to meet household expenses (40.5%) compared to 16.1%; 24.1% and 4.7% of WNBFB, ADF and UNRF reporters respectively.

Only 13.0% of reporters have applied for micro-credit from a financial institution despite reliance on informal credit to meet everyday expenses and that credit is a factor informing reporters understanding of their economic prospects in the future and their ability to be currently economically active. This 13.0% includes 10.8% of female reporters, 13.8% of male reporters and 7.3% of disabled reporters. Age is a factor with older reporters tending to apply for credit rather than younger: 22.1% of reporters aged over 40 years, 10.7% of reporters aged 31-40 years and 5.5% of reporters aged 18-30 years. 53.8% of reporters were successful in their applications including 61.5% of female reporters, 51.3% of male reporter and 42.9% of disabled reporters. Older reporters are more likely to be successful: 64.5% of over 40 years old who have applied have been successful compared to 45.5% of 31-40 years old and 30.0% of 18-30 year olds.

LRA reporters have the lowest level of engagement with formal credit: 5.9% have applied for a micro-credit loan compared to 13.9% of WNBF; 20.8% of ADF and 29.4% of UNRF. Reflecting the age-based analysis above of those who applied 27.3% of LRA applicants were successful compared to 50.0% of WNBF; 60.0% of ADF and 90.9% of UNRF. Currently 33.8% of LRA reporters are engaged in micro-credit activities as are 29.9% of WNBF reporters, 39.4% of ADF reporter and 44.7% of UNRF reporters.

3.6 Economic Associations

To some extent it can be expected that reporters are less involved in micro-economic activities than community members as they have had their linkages disrupted by the conflict than community members and that is reflected in the quantitative survey. 34.3% of reporters are currently involved in any micro-economic activities including 39.4% of female reporters, 32.5% of males and 27.9% of disabled reporters. Age is not a significant factor in involvement of micro-economic activities however UNRF are more likely to be members (44.7%) than ADF, WNBF and LRA (39.4%, 29.9% and 33.8% respectively). However 75.5% of reporters have never been a member of an economic association and 21.8% are currently a member, and 2.7% have been a member previously but are not now.

When considering the type of economic association to which reporters belong unusually reporters identified only one association. It is unlikely that all reporters who are members of economic associations are only members of one, particularly in rural locations where it would be expected that reporters would be members of savings and at least an agricultural association. Consequently it appears that reporters identified the main or the first association in which they are currently members. 53.2% of reporters (including 57.7% of female reporters, 50.9% of male reporters and 50.0% of disabled reporters) are members of local savings, credit societies, village savings and loan associations and credit unions; 22.8% (including 7.7% of female reporters, 30.2% of male reporters and 16.7% of disabled reporters) are members of farmers associations; 8.9% are members of digging associations (including 7.7% of female reporters, 9.4% of male reporters and 8.3% of disabled reporters), and 5.7% are members of IGA associations (including 3.8% of female reporters, 5.7% of male reporters and 2.6% of disabled reporters).

LRA reporters are mainly members of local savings and credit societies: 45.5% compared with 55.3% of WNBF, 60.0% of ADF and 59.3% of UNRF reporters. Of WNBF reporters 31.6% are members of farmers associations compared to 13.6% of LRA, 20.0% of ADF and 16.7% of reporters. Of ADF reporters 20.0% who are members of associations are members of Development Associations compared to 4.5% of LRA reporters and no ADF or UNRF reporters. LRA are the only reporters who are members of digging groups (31.8%).

The study found that 28.1% of reporters who are members of association indicated that their association has a bank account thus confirming some degree of formalization. Of the two most common associations

(savings and farmers), 36.6% of reporters who are members of savings associations indicate that the association has a bank account and 29.2% who are members of agricultural associations identify that the association has a bank account. LRA reporters are least likely to be members of economic associations with bank accounts compared to 35.0% of WNBF reporters; 25.0% of ADF reporters and 50.0% of UNRF reporters. This corresponds with the age demographic: young reporters (18 – 30 years) and disabled reporters are least likely to be members of an association with a bank account:

The majority (91.1%) of reporters who are members of associations are members of associations with a mix of both reporters and non-reporters. Female reporters are the most likely to belong to reporter-only associations: 13.3% of those who have membership are members of reporter-only associations compared to 3.3% of males. WNBF reporters are also most likely to belong to reporter only associations (12.8%). Financial support and economic networking are the two most frequently noted benefits gained by membership of an association, 44.6% and 15.4% respectively. LRA reporters are more inclined to identify economic networking (38.5% compared to 6.7% of WNBF, 0.0% of ADF and 21.4% of UNRF reporters)

Older reporters (over 40 years old and those aged between 31 – 40 years of age) and disabled reporters identify financial support (40.6%, 63.2% and 50.0% respectively) as a key support compared to 16.7% of young reporters aged 18-30 years old. This corresponds to an analysis by armed group with 80.0% of ADF reporters identifying this benefit compared to 57.1% of UNRF reporters, 43.3% of WNBF reporters and 7.7% of LRA reporters. 46.2% of LRA reporters and 23.3% of WNBF reporters identify supply of input products or produce as the benefit derived from membership of associations compare to no ADF or UNRF reporters.

3.7 Migration

In the questioning of reporters around migration reporters often refused to answer some questions, particularly those pertaining to triggers and with whom they consulted prior to migration. Those questions with very low response rate are not discussed below.

A total of 18% have migrated, with 12.9% of reporters have migrated once in recent times, 2.7% twice, 1.5% three times, 0.7% four times and 0.2% five times. Neither gender nor disability is a factor in the frequency of migration, however disabled reporters are less likely to shift: only 8.6% have migrated. LRA, WNBF and ADF reporters migrated 20.0%; 18.4% and 20.0% respectively and UNRF reporters 9.3%. Very small percentages of all groups migrated more than once: 1.2% of LRA respondents migrated twice; 5.7%, 2.5% and 1.3% of WNBF reporters migrated twice, three times and four times respectively. 5.7% and 2.9% of ADF reporters migrated three times and five times respectively and 2.3% of UNRF reporters migrated four times.

To a small extent general discrimination informed migration of reporters (77.3%); discrimination on the basis of being a reporter (79.5%) informed the decision to shift. Young reporters were more motivated by discrimination because of being a reporter: 30.8% say their decision to shift was to a large extent informed by such discrimination, 15.4% to a medium extent and 85.7% to a small extent compared to 0.0% of those aged 31-40 years and 11.1% of those aged over 40 years. The LRA reporters have the highest response rate overall to being motivated by discrimination on the basis of being a reporter with 28.6% identifying this motivated them to a large extent, 21.4% to a medium extent and 50.0% to a small extent. UNRF are the least motivated by such discrimination with 1000.0% identifying that it motivated them to a small extent.

However, in general negative stigma is not a trigger or an issue for those who have migrated. Of the 91 reporters who have migrated 7 identify that in fact they carry a positive stigma. In some instances it would appear that positive stigma relates to how some reporters were included by authorities in some activities on the assumption that they had information, expertise or had to be 'placated' by giving them certain posts. An example of this would be in Yumbe where reporters' concentrations were high and had a significant development association which gave the impression that they were accessing many development projects, more than non-reporter groups. In Gulu reporters have become members of the local council which is a sign that they are well integrated but also that they are conversant with matters of security and could deal with security issues. Alternatively it is suggested that reporters may have been inserted in those positions as a buffer to further insecurity. It is also possible that positive stigma refers to how some reporters are successful sometimes economically or politically so that they are much better off than the rest of the community despite the fact that they had been away in the bush. This success carries a positive stigma.

Fourteen reporters state they have a negative stigma and seventy that they have no stigma. Across armed groups it is some of the LRA, WNBFB and UNRF reporters who have migrated who carry positive stigma. Analyzed by armed group of those who have migrated 63.2% of LRA, 90.3% of WNBFB, 100.0% of ADF and 72.7% of UNRF say they carry no stigma. Gender is not a distinguishing factor. 50% of LRA reporters have considered migration to get a better job, compared to 31.8% of WNBFB, 55.9% of ADF and 27.9% of UNRF reporters.

For reporters who have migrated more than once the following table presents the pattern. Actual numbers are identified where they are low and may compromise the validity of percentages.

Table A21. Migration overview (combined reporter and community)

Both reporters and community respondents	Place lived at the end of the conflict - description		Place where migrated for first time - description		Place where migrated for second time - description		Place where migrated for third time - description		Place where currently live - description	
	N=	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=	%
Kampala	0	0	5	6.3	1	4.3	0	0	1	1.1
District capital	5	5.4	4	5.1	1	4.3	1	10.0	2	2.1
Town	8	8.6	18	22.8	3	13.0	1	10.0	9	9.5
Rural-urban edge or periphery	11	11.8	13	16.5	6	26.1	3	30.0	14	14.7
Rural settlement, village	66	71.0	37	46.8	12	52.2	4	40.0	68	71.6
Isolated rural homestead	3	3.2	2	2.5	0	0	1	10.0	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0	79	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	95	100.0

As can be seen, for rural-urban migration it appears that respondents initially moved to Kampala but have since left. Similarly reporters who moved to the district capital appear to have left and the return in both cases is back to rural settlement or villages.

When reporters are disaggregated from the above sample, while the numbers are limited there is no true net migration but there are movement patterns. Initially at the end of conflict 76.4% of reporters resided in rural settlement or villages (86.0% of LRA, 82.6% of WNBFB, 65.7% of ADF and 66.7% of UNRF reporters) and currently 73% reside there with approximately the same division by armed group. This is very small migration. Similarly initially 9.7% of reporters resided on the rural-urban periphery (5.5% of LRA, 10.3% of WNBFB, 20.0% of ADF and 7.7% of UNRF reporters) and currently 13.5% reside there with approximately the same proportional division by armed group. At the end of conflict 9.7% of

reporters were in towns (3.0% LRA, 3.2% WNBF, 20.0% ADF and 7.7% UNRF) and currently 10.8% reside there (4.8% LRA, 1.9% WNBF, 11.4% ADF and 0.0% UNRF). Once more a very small migration.

For reporters with multiple shifts there appears to be a migration pattern: on first and second shift reporters tend to move within rural areas significantly more than rural to urban. On a third shift there is some movement to the rural-urban periphery but overall as seen above population distribution tends to remain the stable.

Turning to migration patterns, at demobilization 78.0% of reporters returned to their community of origin, 16.5% moved somewhere else and 5.5% stayed where they were. To a large extent there is parity across age and gender with only older reporters and disabled reporters showing derivation: 70.6% of older reporters returned to their community of origin, 20.6 went somewhere else and 8.8% stayed where they were. 7.03% of disabled reporters returned to a community of original, 20.0% went elsewhere and 6.7% stayed where they were. More young reporters 18-30 years old were returned to an IDP camp (43.6%) compared to older reporters: 23.8% (18-30 year olds) and 5.7% (over 40 year olds). More females 38.7% were returned to IDP camps compared to 18.8% of males. This includes 50% of LRA reporters and 9.1% of WNBF reporters only. When examined by armed group it shows that of the four main groups the ADF reporters were most likely to go somewhere else around demobilization.

Table A22. Place of first migration (by armed group)

After the conflict, around the time of demobilization, but before you started the Amnesty Commission package, where did you go first?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
I returned to the community I left or from where I was abducted from prior to the conflict	84.6%	71.0%	62.5%	81.8%
Went to some other place	12.8%	16.1%	37.5%	18.2%
Stayed where I was	2.6%	12.9%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	39	31	8	11

The study found that 25% of reporters identify that a single trigger motivated them to shift: 75% that they were motivated by multiple triggers. There is a wide disparity between female and male reporters with 60.0% of females identifying that it was single trigger compared to 13.3% of males. 33.3% of reporters in 18-3 year old category identify a single trigger compared to 12.5% of 31-40 year olds and 33.3% of those over 40 years.

Reporters were asked to identify three nominations for those who influenced their decision to shift. Of the group that answered the question (19 reporters) 84.0% identified it was their own; 47.4% that it was with their families, and 26.3% that the influencer was their spouse. The table below shows a breakout of responses around drivers for migration. Overall there is a very low response rate to this question with the significant majority of relevant respondents choosing not to answer.

Of the group of 19 since moving to their new place 69.6% of reporters identify that it is better than their previous location compared to 8.7% who state it is worse. All female reporters identified that it was better compared to 61.1% of males and the 11.1% of males who identified it was worse. Age is not a distinguishing factor.

Table A23. Migration triggers (by armed group)

<i>Only proportion of reporters who migrated that indicated 'yes' to the listed trigger</i>	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Total	
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Percent
Is the listed factor a reason for your most recent shift						
Others moving there with you	0	3	0	0	3	14.3
Family or friends	1	6	1	0	8	38.1
Housing or shelter	0	4	4	0	8	38.1
Land or farming access	0	4	1	0	5	23.8
Job opportunity or possibility of work	0	5	2	1	8	40.0
Less rent or cheaper abode	0	3	0	0	3	15.0
Absence of stigma, anonymity, to be free, absence of discrimination	0	1	0	0	1	5.0
Increased security	0	1	0	0	1	5.0
Escape the memories associated with your environment or psychological triggers	0	1	0	0	1	5.0
To be close to assistance or the Amnesty Commission	0	1	0	0	1	5.0
Assistance for medical, disability or psychological needs	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Education opportunities or assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	2	13	4	1	20	100.0
Average N =	2	13	4	1	20	

The study found that 80.0% of reporters have no plans for a further shift (85.7% of female reporters and 77.8% of male reporters), 4.0% are likely to shift in the short time (14.3% of female reporters and 0.0% of male reporters) and 16.0% in the next small number of years (0.0% of female reporters and 22.9% of male reporters). Also 35.0% believe they will someday return to their communities including 20.0% of female reporters and 40.0% of male reporters as well as 50.0% of 18-30 year old reporters, 44.4% of those aged 31-40 and 22.2% of those aged over 40 years.

3.8 Findings and summary comparison with the community

The trajectory of reporter employment is positive, with more reporters employed now than at demobilization. The nature of reporter employment closely corresponds with that of the rest of the community revealing little distinction in the sectors in which reporters are employed or studying or and the percentage in each sector. Reporters have a low unemployment rate at 9.2% but it is still higher than the community rate of 5.1%. The majority of reporters and community members are concentrated in self-employment agriculture (66.2% and 55.4% respectively) 5.0% of reporters study while 7.3% of community members do also. There is a correlation across all demographics between reporter and community members. What this shows is that labour market is not stratified in any significant way to either section off reporters from community or to have a negative bias against reporters.

More reporters believe their economic situation will improve in the future than not (65.5% compared to 34.5%) with young reporters and so those of the LRA being most positive about the future: 70.4% of young reporters believe their situation will improve and 92.0% of LRA reporters. Female reporters are less positive than their male counterparts with 60.8% of females and 67.0% of males expressing the belief that things will improve. This correlates across demographics with community response where 72.7% of community members see their economic situation improving in the future including 64.8% of female and 76.2% of males. Differences arise in so far as 18-30 year olds in the community are more positive than 18-30 year olds reporters: 85.2% believe their situation will improve compared to 70.4% of reporters but both percentages are high with limited difference. Collectively reporter and community also broadly agree on the reasons for believing their personal economic situation will improve in the near future with both groups emphasizing: (i) improved agricultural productivity (29.0% and 23.3% respectively); (ii) improved productivity, working hard and saving (11.9% and 13.3% respectively), and (iii) improved or expanding business (11.9% to 15.0%). Differences are minor with reporters twice as likely to identify government assistance as a reason for their optimism (12.3% compared to 5.0% of community) and have a professed greater reliance on faith and hope that their child will get an education, job and support their

parents in the future (3.6% and 2.8% of reporters respectively compared to 0.0% of community members)

Reporters and community agree that it is more difficult for reporters to find employment however proportionally more reporters identify this than community members.

Table A24. Perceived difficulty in obtaining employment (reporter and community)

Do you think reporters find it harder than others to get a job?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Yes	81.2%	71.3%	89.7%	78.6%	67.6%	80.0%	57.4%	64.2%	67.5%	57.9%	48.1%
No	18.8%	28.7%	10.3%	21.4%	32.4%	20.0%	42.6%	35.8%	32.5%	42.1%	51.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	303	101	155	98	148	70	122	53	83	38	52

Despite these differences reporter and communities have a shared understanding of the barriers to employability experienced by reporters: (i) no or low qualifications (47.0% of reporters, 56.6% of community members); (ii) stigma towards reporters (16.9% of reporters, 9.1% of community members); (iii) lack of education (12.9% of reporters, 6.1% of community members), and (iv) lack of experience (9.3% of reporters and 6.1% of community members). Reporters and community also share the same threats to economic productivity however, there is some divergence regarding access to credit. 32.3% of reporters identify lack of financial support or capital as threat compared to 17.0% of the community. 22.6% of reporters identify ill health or age compared to 31.9% of the community and 7.3% of reporters identify inflation compared to 14.9% of the community. There are subtle differences between the two groups with the community's lesser concern about capital possibly revealing the more established economic practices in the community in comparison to those by reporters (also a symptom of reporters recovering from the time lost that they spent in the bush). Also the community is more worried about inflation than the reporters, which also supports the idea that reporters are at an earlier economic stage and so more affected by issues more common less established economic activities.

Reporters and community have similar household compositions including roles in the household and the percentage who are sole breadwinners (40.4% of reporters compared to 44.8% of community members). Across demographics there is broad correlation with the main variances being that a higher percentage of reporter females are sole breadwinners (30.7% compared to 22.6% in the community) and a lesser percentage of 18-30 year olds are sole breadwinners (25.8% of 18-30 year old reporters compared to 35.1% in the community). There is correlation across the demographics of the reporter and community sample regarding the percentage of HHI earned with the only notable variation being where 24.4% of 31-40 year old reporters ear 61-80% of HHI compared to 50.0% of community members in the same age category.

Reporters and community members have the same situation regarding meeting monthly household expenses: 32.7% of reporters break even, 24.2% rely on family transfers and 34.1% usually borrow compared to 29.1% of community members breaking even, 21.1% relying on family money transfers and 42.4% usually borrowing. The slightly higher recourse to credit in the community is reflective on the tendency in reporter group to rely more heavily on the family for economic assistance.

Reporters have less access to micro-credit than community members: 13.0% of reporters have applied for credit from a financial institution compared to 22.0% of community members. Reporters are slightly less successful in their applications with 53.8% of reporters being successful compared to 64.9% of community members. Across demographics the main difference is regarding 18-30 year old reporters and

31 – 40 year old reporters of whom 30.0% and 45.5% are successful compared to 42.9% and 73.7% of community members. The statistics for 31-40 year olds possibly reflects the less established economic practices of reporters in comparison to community members.

Reporters are less involved in micro-economic activities than community members as they have had their linkages disrupted by the conflict than community members and that is reflected in the quantitative survey. The study found that 34.3% of reporters are currently involved in micro-economic activities compared to 55.0% of community members. Female reporters and reporters in the 31-40 age category show the largest difference with their comparative demographic group in the community: 39.4% of female reporters and 35.1% of reporters aged 31-40 are involved in micro-economic activities compared to 68.4% of females in the community and 75.0% of 31-40 year old community members. This appears to consolidate the finding that female reporters are an risk group with less access to economic networks (and as will be seen social networks) and that the characteristics of the economic activities of reporters in the 31-40 year category are less established than those of the corresponding demographic group in the community and so face challenges associated with the stage of business or economic development, something which is in turn a symptom of the gradual recovery from lost years in the bush

Similarly comparing membership of economic associations (reporters since demobilization and community members over the preceding two years) reporters are less active than community members: 21.8% of reporters and 42.9% of community members are current members. reporters in the 31-40 year category show the largest differences with 23.6% of reporters in the category being members of economic associations compared with 65.0% of 31-40 year old community members.

Regarding the two vulnerable groups that are most visible in the report findings, female reports continue to exhibit disadvantage most notably in educational achievement. ADF reporters have highest level of unemployment and are more likely to resort begging (37.5%) with 12.5% relying on being provided for by other family members. Also ADF reporters have the highest percentage that relies on credit to meet household expenses. Despite these negative economic indicators ADF reporters still have a rate of membership of economic association that is comparable with reporters from other armed groups.

4. Social Capital

To examine social capital it is necessary at some stages in the analysis to integrate more fully community responses as social capital, particularly as it is captured by the quantitative tools (networks, trust, social cohesion, social inclusion, social change) require that at times a whole community perspective is required to accurately gauge key findings. Consequently, this section of the report contains more findings from the community survey than in other sections.

4.1 Networks and sociability

In post-conflict recovery ex-combatants usually belong to less social groups than their civilian counterparts at least in part because they are in a more challenging situation when rebuilding pre-war networks and creating new. In Uganda it is no different with 20% less reporters belonging to social networks than ordinary community members. The study found that 60.1% of reporters do not belong to a social group. 24.7% belong to 1 group, 8.8% to 2 groups, 6.4% to 3 or more groups.

Table A25. Social groups that reporters belong to (by armed group and gender)

How many social groups do you belong to?	Name of armed faction reporter belonged to							
	LRA		WNBF		ADF		UNRF	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
No social groups	83.9%	83.0%	44.5%	41.4%	72.0%	50.0%	38.5%	11.8%
1 Social group	14.4%	14.9%	32.0%	34.5%	16.0%	30.0%	34.6%	41.2%
2 Social groups	1.7%	2.1%	11.7%	20.7%	12.0%	20.0%	11.5%	17.6%
3 or more social groups	.0%	.0%	11.7%	3.4%	.0%	.0%	15.4%	29.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	118	47	128	29	25	10	26	17

Currently 27 LRA reporters belong to social groups, 88 WNBF, 12 ADF and 31 UNRF. Of this sample when analyzed by mean score on average the UNRF reporters belong to the most number of groups followed by the WNBF reporters, the ADF reporters and the LRA reporters.¹³ Reporters from the WNBF belong to less social groups than a year ago which may be a negative trend indicating that they are participating less in society. LRA reporters and ADF reporters show some social stability by neither growing nor declining the number of social groups they belong to over time (91.9% and 97.0% respectively). Across gender and age categories there is very little difference within the reporter demographics for example, 83.5% of female reporters belong to the same number as last year compared to 86.0% male reporters and 86.9% disabled reporters. 7.2% of female reporters are in more social groups compared to 5.3% of males and 6.6% of disabled reporters. The older reporters are slightly more active with 7.8% joining more groups compared to 6.1% of 31-40 year old reporters and 3.6% of 18 – 30 year old reporters.

As an indicator in the level of involvement in community development reporters were asked whether they are on a management committee or organizing committee. The responses indicate that female reporters, young reporters and disabled reporters are not occupying many management positions. While some of this may be explained by norms such as seniority in the community, the response point to how overall these three groups are least integrated and along with the old are most at risk of social exclusion. 24.3% of reporters hold management/committee/organizing roles including 18.9% of female reporters, 12.1% of young reporters aged 18-30 years and 21.8% of disabled reporters compared to 26.2% of male reporters, 26.5% of reporters aged 31-40 and 34.4% of reporters aged over 40. This distinction is replicated in armed groups with 6.8% of LRA reporters holding such a post compared to 35.5% of WNBF reporters, 17.2% of ADF reporters and 41.2% of UNRF reporters.

¹³ LRA mean; 1.11; WNBF mean, 1.83; ADF mean, 1.42 and UNRF mean, 1.87

In comparison to the community reporters are nearly half as likely to be in a management role: 24.3% of reporters are in such a role compared to 46.1% of the community. This ratio is largely consistent across the demographics of reporter and community when so compared.

Reporter social networks are sizeable but more limited than those of comparable community members with 64.7% of reporters having “lots of friends” and 25.3% having “a few, but good friends”. Those who have least friends are: female reporters and disabled reporters. 16.5% of female reporters say they have not many friends as do 16.7% of disabled reporters compared with 7.9% of male reporters. For female and disabled reporters the limitations of networks of friends elaborates the picture of vulnerability in terms of livelihoods, security, literacy and employment. In comparison 5.4% of community members have “not many friends”. Across key demographics female reporters, reporters in the 18-30 year category and the 31-40 year category have smaller social networks with 16.5%, 11.9% and 10.9% respectively indicating they have not many friends compared to 11.3%, 5.1% and 5.6% in the community.

Lesser numbers of friends and the fact that female reporters in particular have a limited social circle and stunted social networks is another limitation on personal security and on psychological vulnerability as risks of isolation will increase in some cases compounding the trauma already endured as a result of conflict. Those reporters with not many friends are concentrated in the LRA and the ADF reporters where respectively there are 11.2% and 30.3% who state they have not many friends. WNBFB and UNRF reporters appear to have the most solid networks: 74.3% of WNBFB reporters say they have lots of friends and 20.8% say a few but good friends while 71.8% of UNRF reporters have lots of friends and 25.6% have a few but good friends.

Describing their friends the most useful finding is that reporters tend to have few reporter friends. Consolidated, 52.3% have few reporter friends and 15.7% have none. This is distributed across armed groups as follows: LRA 60.1% few, 12.3% none; WNBFB 46.5% few, 19.1% none, ADF, 45.7% few, 22.9% none, and UNRF 51.2%, few 9.3% none.

Table A26. Diversity of friends: friends who are reporters (by demographics)

Thinking about your friend, are most of them reporters such as yourself?	Reporter						Total reporter sample
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	
Most	12.9%	13.5%	16.8%	10.0%	10.7%	14.7%	13.0
Some	18.8%	19.2%	10.3%	23.0%	25.5%	16.2%	18.9
Few	52.1%	52.9%	60.0%	50.0%	46.3%	55.9%	52.3
None	16.2%	14.4%	12.9%	17.0%	17.4%	13.2%	15.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0
	303	104	155	100	149	68	407

Other characteristics of friends including: same age; and same gender; as the respondent show little variance across armed groups and the majority of the sample for all groups identifies that their network of friends is of similar age and similar gender. The percentages match the community sample meaning that in composition reporters have similar networks of friends to community members. Reporter responses vary more around the educational background of friends: 39.9% of LRA reporters have few friends with the same educational background and 14.7% have none; WNBFB reporters 32.2% have few and 6.6% have none; ADF reporters 38.2% have few and 20.6% have none and UNRF reporters, 48.8% have few and 9.8% have none. Again, this pattern is similar to the community sample. Other demographics in the reporter sample are consistent across gender and disability. reporters generally feel valued in their community (48.0% of females, 62.7% of males and 53.6% of disabled reporters feel highly valued compared to 44.1%, 32.7% and 34.8% who feel medium valued) with female reporters, young reporters

aged 18-30 and disabled reporters recording the highest percentages who feel lowly valued: 7.8%, 9.0% and 11.6% respectively). While there is similarity with these gender and age demographics in the community sample the percentages are much lower (3.5%, and 2.4%).

Family networks are strong and reporters have full/high contact with family and this applies across all demographics. The frequency of contact also applies across all demographics with 92.8% having daily contact which is the same as the community.

Table A27. Contact networks

If you encounter an economic problem, whom would you first turn to for help?	Type of respondent	
	Reporter	Community
No-one	12.7%	4.6%
Family	45.8%	36.6%
Friends	30.0%	43.4%
Community leaders, Parish Chief, religious leaders	4.6%	1.1%
Local indigenous credit-saving structures, micro-lending structures, formal banks	6.6%	12.6%
Other	.3%	1.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
	393	175

Reporters could be overly dependent on the family for support networks as 45.8% of reporters turn to their family first for economic help. This is particularly the case in younger reporters of whom 64.6% rely heavily on family. Reporters do also turn to friends who are not reporters (15.3%) compared to friends who are reporters 3.1%. Most worrying is that 12.7% of reporters have no social support networks for economic issues: they have no one to turn to for economic help. Female reporters and reporters in the 18-30 year old category are more in this high vulnerability category with 14.4% and 18.2% respectively having no-one to turn to compared to the mean. Reporters in the 18-30 year old category and disabled reporters are most likely to rely on family: 64.6% and 44.8% respectively.

In comparison to reporters the community has a far more diverse pattern of economic support. Less turn to family than in reporters and repeating previous comparative patterns in accessing credit more access official credit through credit-savings structures and micro-lending. Similarly fewer access charitable sources than reporters. This pattern supports the analysis that reporters are more reliant on family and informal borrowing than community members who have a more diverse and stable network through which they can access economic support.

Across armed groups WNBFB reporters are the most isolated in terms of economic support networks with 18.6% of WNBFB reporters have no-one to turn to compared with 12.0% of LRA, 5.7% of ADF and 2.3% of UNRF. LRA have the highest dependency upon family (62.7%) compared to 35.3% of WNBFB, 42.9% of ADF and 32.6% of UNRF reporters. ADF reporters are the most likely to turn to non-reporter friends for economic support (34.3%) compared to 8.0% of LRA. 16.0% of WNBFB and 18.6% of UNRF reporters. This does not correspond to the reporter-non-reporter composition of friends of reporters and indicates that there are other drivers for reporters to turn to non-reporter friends rather than reporter friends, possibly non-reporter friends are in better economic circumstances, but it does reflect the overall tendency of reporters not to utilize old command structures as a social network.

Sociability is assessed through the frequency with which reporters meet socially, in this case, in a public place, to talk, eat or drink with other people. The study found that 42.0% of reporters have not met socially in the last week compared to 35.2% of community members. The 42.0% contains the most vulnerable reporter populations including 57.7% of female reporters, 58.0% of 18-30 year old reporters and 41.4% of disabled reporters confirming the isolation and weak social networks of these sub-groups of reporters. These percentages also continue the trend in the comparative analysis with community

members where 49.1% of female community members and 44.0% of 18-30 year olds aged 18-30 have not met anyone socially in the last week. Of those reporters who have met some socially they have a similar mean score to their community counterparts. The frequency with which reporters meet is largely the same as two years previously (56.9%) with 21.8% identifying that it is more often than 2 years ago and 21.3% as less than 2 years ago. This is similar to community members. Female reporters and 18-30 year old reporters have the lowest percentage showing an increase in frequency: 14.3% and 13.6% respectively compared to the average. ADF show the greatest stability with 76.5% stating the frequency of their social meetings is the same as 2 years ago compared to 68.0% of LRA, 45.5% of ADF and 52.4% of UNRF reporters. 23.4% of WNBF reporters show the greatest percentage stating the frequency of their social meetings has decreased compared to 19.7% of LRA, 11.8% of ADF and 23.8% of UNRF reporters.

4.2 Trust and Solidarity

Overall there is little difference between reporters and the community in terms of trust. In all areas there is close to parity: (i) to the extent to which people in the community can be trusted; (ii) across the categories of people whom can be trusted in society, (iii) explanation why levels of trust have changed. 66.8% of reporters have high trust in people in their community compared to 66.7% of community members. Those identifying low trust are 13.7% of reporters compared to 17.3% of community members and this is the biggest variance across the assessment of trust and solidarity. Corresponding with the isolation of female reporters, they plus those aged 18-30 years old and disabled these sub-groups give the lowest rating of high trust and the highest of low trust: 54.8% of female reporters trust people to a high degree, compared to 52.9% of those aged 18-30 years old and 60.0% of reporters compared to the average and 70.7% of male reporters, 77.6% of 31-40 year olds and 73.4% of over 40 year old reporters. This compared to 58.8% of female community members and 54.5% of 18-30 year old community members. When examined by mean score LRA and ADF reporters trust people in the community least, a finding which corresponds to the tendency for LRA and ADF to socialize less with people outside their gender and age band suggesting that these groups of reporters have trust issues affecting their wider reintegration. This is also a behavioral symptom of trauma following prolonged conflict.

Examining levels of trust and mistrust of categories of people in the community, reporters and community members largely have parity. Reporters reserve the highest level of mistrust for strangers (75.0%) (compared to 84.0% of community members); private business owners or entrepreneurs (24.8%) and government employees in the security ministries (22.0%). Community members show marginally less trust in all categories of individuals but the differences between reports and communities are limited.. Analysis across gender and age categories for reporters shows that females are marginally less trusting of authority than their male counterparts and slightly more trusting than their community member counterparts. Disabled reporters sit between male and female reporters' responses confirming overall the equal levels of trust across reporter demographics. When examined across armed groups there is correlation between ADF socializing less and showing less trust in all groups in comparison to other reporters from the other armed groups. In particular the ADF have very low trust in strangers (6.1% indicating they do trust strangers compared to 34.9% of LRA, 17.3% of WNBF and 34.1% of UNRF reporters. Similarly 58.8% of ADF trust reporters compared to 82.0% of LRA, 84.7% of WNBF and 81.4% of UNRF reporters.

Although both the reporters and the community hold similar levels of trust in the people in their community and both the same proportion of reporters and community (7.7% and 7.8% respectively) feel that trust is getting worse, the community diverged from the reporters in that 63.3% of the community feel that trust is showing an upward trend compared to only 43.6% of reporters. 48.6% of the reporters and 28.9% if the community feel that trust is at the same level as previously.

There is no divergence of the views of reporters and the views of the community as to why trust has improved: 32.1% of reporters believe it is because people collaborate and work better than before; 30.4% because of togetherness, increased friendliness and trust; 15.5% because of the safety, security and peace levels, and 11.9% because of regular meetings, good intra-community communications and agreed platforms for sharing problems. There is also little divergence within reporter groups on the basis of age of disability.

Across armed groups there is little overall divergence between the numbers of LRA, WNBF, ADF and UNRF reporters who believe trust has disapproved: 7.0%, 8.9%, 9.1% and 4.7% respectively. The main divergence is in how more LRA reporters believe it has remained the same in comparison to the other groups: 64.6%, 39.9%, 39.4% and 32.6% respectively. Still LRA reporters are in a similar range to those of the other groups regarding speaking out about a disagreement with 70.1% of LRA assert they would definitely speak out, 21.3% yes but on certain matters compared to WNBF 66.7% and 22.9%; ADF 74.3% and 5.7%, and UNRF 86.0% and 11.6%. It can be reasoned from this finding that reporters self-regulate when they speak out about disputes and that the high numbers willing to talk is an indication of a culture of dialogue and security.

Regarding the drivers for trust to improve in the past year, relevant reporters differed in their analysis but not hugely. All groups attributed importance to: (i) better collaboration, and (ii) togetherness, but the ADF reporters also identified that people are engaged in constructive pursuits or activities and the UNRF reporters identified safety and security considerations as key drivers.¹⁴

The degree to which reporters are open about their past strongly correlates to the level of trust they perceive in society. Similarly there is strong correlation (except for the WNBF where 40.8% of reporters are open about their past and yet 81.5% state that people do not treat them any differently because of their past) between whether or not the reporter believes others treat them differently because of your past and their willingness to be open. The level of perceived trust is part of a two way process with reporters whereby they can be open about their past and thus reap the benefits of increased openness and sense of togetherness. One of the benefits is increased trust in the community which should further enable reporters to remain open and contribute to stable reintegration and acceptance.

Table A28. Personal transparency (by armed group)

		LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Are you open about your past?	Yes	62.8%	59.2%	48.6%	83.7%
	No	37.2%	40.8%	51.4%	16.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		164	157	35	43
Do others treat you differently because of your past?	Yes	42.6%	18.5%	41.2%	9.8%
	No	57.4%	81.5%	58.8%	90.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		162	151	34	41
Are there some people you regret telling about your past?	Yes	38.2%	25.7%	58.8%	22.0%
	No	61.8%	74.3%	41.2%	78.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		165	144	34	41

¹⁴ Those who had answered that the trust had dis-improved were asked to elaborate however the response rates are so low 21 reporters and 12 community that there is a significant risk that a statistical analysis will skew the report findings. For example, the 12 community members attribute most of the blame for dis-improved trust to reporters however this is unreliable because: (i) there is such a positive response rate and (ii) the overall findings of the report suggest high levels of reintegration, mutual respect and diverse social networks and both of these factors indicate that the responses are likely to be heavily biased perhaps on personal grounds.

The study found that 65.4% of reporters self-identify as contributing something for the benefit of the community compared to 76.9% of community. Female reporters believe they contribute less than males and the average, as do younger reporters and disabled reporters: 53.8% of female reporters identify they contributed compared to 69.3% of male reporters and 58.0% of disabled reporters. 51.3% of young reporters aged 18 – 30 years contributed compared to 69.7% aged 31 – 40 years and 77.2% over 40 year olds. These are less across the board than community but follow the same trajectory. When examined by armed group there is consistency across armed groups. Within the LRA sample which is the youngest concentration 51.3% of 18-30 year olds believe they are contributing the least. Crucially 33.3% of the female LRA reporters aged 18-30 years feel like they are contributing to the benefit of the community, compared to the average reporter sample of 65.4%.

4.3 Social Cohesion and Inclusion

The question and responses that clearly summarize the high level of social cohesion and inclusion is as follows. 94.5% of reporters feel part of the community compared to 96.7% of community members.

There is uniformity across the demographics of both the reporter and the community sample with the young reporters aged 18 -30 years being returning the lowest positive response (92.1%) and reporters over 40 years old the highest (97.3%). In the community the lowest is returned by females (93.0%) and the highest by 31 – 40 year olds (100%).

Table A29. Belonging (reporter and community responses)

Do you feel part of this community or do you feel like an outsider?	Reporter	Community	Total
Yes – part of the community	94.5%	96.7%	95.2%
Yes – an outsider	5.5%	3.3%	4.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	401	180	581

The study found that 20.9% of reporters believed that to a great extent diversity is a characteristic of their area of residence, 16.4% neither great nor small extent and 62.7% to a small extent. When compared by mean score across demographics to the community responses it can be seen that reporter and community are strongly corresponding and that within the demographics of the reporter sample there is broad agreement on the levels of diversity.

When examined across armed groups the ADF reporters most identify that there are “lots of differences” between people (32.4%) compared to LRA, WNBF and UNRF reporters of which 22.5%, 19.0% and 9.8% that there are many differences. The higher response rate of the ADF could be linked to the peri-urban location of many of the respondents.

Despite the testimony that there is diversity and difference in their communities there is a majority in reporters and in the community who identify that these differences do cause problems such as disagreement, argument and disputes. 55.4% of reporters agree that differences cause problems composed of 57.6% of female reporters; 54.7% of male reporters and 73.3% of reporters aged 18-30 years; 48.5% of reporters aged 31-40 years; 48.5% of reporters aged over 40 years and 60.3% of disabled reporters. This compares with 77.2% of female community members; 65.3% of male community members, 78.3% of 18 -30 year old, 67.5% of 31-40 year old, and 58.9% of over 40 year old community members.

Table A30. Perceptions of diversity (by demographics)

Usually there are differences between people living in the same area; to what extent do any such differences - diversity of people - characterize your area?		Mean	N
18-30 years	Reporter	2.34	152
	Community	2.29	83
	Total	2.32	235
31-40 years	Reporter	2.37	100
	Community	2.25	40
	Total	2.34	140
Over 40 years	Reporter	2.54	147
	Community	2.43	56
	Total	2.51	203
Male	Reporter	2.41	301
	Community	2.37	124
	Total	2.40	425
Female	Reporter	2.46	101
	Community	2.23	57
	Total	2.37	158
Disabled reporter	Reporter	2.35	68
Total	Reporter	2.42	402
	Community	2.33	181
	Total	2.39	583
Key: The nearer to 1 the mean score, implies great extent i.e. lots of differences between people The nearer to 3 the mean score, implies to a small extent i.e. few differences between people			

It is likely that the kinds of disputes being discussed are normal civil disputes not caused by reporters. This is so because there is negligible percentage of community members who blame serious disputes affecting trust and social bonds on reporters and because overall there are strong indicators throughout that reporters and community are very well integrated (see footnote 17 and finding regarding togetherness below for example) broad category of problems (disagreement, argument and dispute). It is wholly likely that both reporter and community member are referring to the levels disagreement and disharmony that are part and parcel of a diverse community particularly where there are significant shared development challenges.

The study found that 84.0% of reporters state that they have a strong feeling of togetherness with the people with whom they live in the community. Across the reporter demographics there is similarity with the percentage except for those aged 18-30 years and disabled reporters of whom 77.6% and 73.9% identify that they get a strong feeling of togetherness with the community around them. This corresponds with how 88.5% of the community report that they are close to the other people in the community with some differences when demographics are broken out in the community sample revealing that 80.7% of females; 92.0% of males, 84.5% of 18-30 year olds, 90.0% of 31-40 year olds and 94.6% of over 40 year olds have strong feelings of togetherness. When examined by armed group there is broad similarity across groups and the findings which are that the UNRF most identify strongly (97.7%) and the LRA least but still highly (78.7%) confirm the findings that overall there is strongly integrated communities. Underlining this is table A29 above where 94.5% of reporters identify that they feel part of the community in comparison to 96.7% of community members.

4.4 Empowerment

Measuring empowerment the survey examines the feelings or belief of respondents about their current emotional or psychological state, namely: (i) the extent to which respondents feel generally happy; (ii) that they have power to make important decisions; (iii) the degree to which they have control over decisions affecting everyday life; (iv) the extent to which they feel valued, and (v) the ability to make important decisions to change the course of one's life, and t. The survey also examined the degree to which respondents engaged in collective political activity and their perceptions on leadership. To analyze the first five points the report bases the analysis on mean scoring first and then on percentage responses in order to gain a more accurate understanding.

Based on mean score throughout the responses to questions around happiness and empowerment there is no relevant divergence between reporter and community responses. Reporters and community in all demographics are generally happy and believe that have some power to make important decisions that can change the course of their lives. Reporters and community members believe they have some control over decisions that affect their everyday lives and much more control and ability to make important decisions about their lives that could change its course.

Regarding percentages, female reporters, reporters over 40 years of age and disabled reporters have the most common instances of unhappiness (17.5%, 14.8% and 18.8% respectively) something that is reflected in the community where 15.8% of females and 14.3% of those over 40 are unhappy). Female reporters, reporters aged 18 – 30 and disabled reporters return negative high percentages in (i) the small extent to which they have power to make decisions affecting everyday life (30.7%, 30.5% and 30.0% respectively); (ii) the extent to which they feel they have control over very few decision that affect them (16.7%; 17.9% and 17.1% respectively); (iii) that they feel unable to change their lives (16.7%, 10.3% and 20.0%). These percentages correspond by demographic and size to the responses from the community group.

Regarding collective political action, respondents were asked in the past year how often they you joined other people to express concerns to GoU officials or local leaders on issues benefiting the community? IT was identified that 49.9% of reporters have never expresses concerns and the most vulnerable groups are the most politically silent: female reporters (63.1%), reporters aged 18-30 years (71.6%) and disabled reporters (60.0%). While this compares to the community sample where female and 18-30 year olds rate highest (50.9% and 50.0%) it emphasizes that these sub-groups of reporters are the least vocal around political issues that matter to the community. During field work some reporters stated to the survey staff and team leaders that they believed if they engaged in any political agitation it could result in them losing their amnesty and so they were politically silent. Taking this into consideration it is still notable that some reporters can be less than half as likely as community members to make their political voice heard in a group setting. While across demographics there is approximately similarity between the percentage of reporters and communities who have never engaged in political action, when those who have engaged are analyzed, it is evident that active community members are twice as likely to be active multiple times, particularly 5 or less time and more than five times.

Table A1. Solidarity in express concerns to GoU or leaders (by demographics)

In the past year,	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years

Many times, more than five	10.9%	8.7%	3.9%	12.0%	15.4%	12.9%	23.2%	12.3%	14.3%	25.0%	23.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	304	103	155	100	149	70	125	57	84	40	56

When the reporter sample is examined by armed group it quickly establishes that the LRA reporters have very little solidarity when expressing their feelings of dissatisfaction with 76.7% never expressing concerns in a group setting compared to 29.3% of WNBF, 45.7% of ADF and 27.9% of UNRF reporters. UNRF have most frequently expressed concerns: 39.5% have done so five times or less and 25.6% have done so more than five times compared with 31.8% and 12.7% of WNBF reporters, 25.6% and 8.6% of ADF reporters and 8.0% and 2.5% of LRA reporters respectively.

Because of this finding when responses to question to what extent the local government and local leaders take into account concerns voiced by your community when they make decisions that affect you, the low mean score of the LRA respondents (and 18-30 year olds) could indicate that they hold paternal view of authority and have a less questioning trust in leaders.

Table A32. Interaction with leaders (by armed groups)

To what extent do local government and local leaders take into account concerns voiced by your community when they make decisions that affect you?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
A lot	36.1%	9.4%	3.1%	33.3%
A little	51.3%	61.7%	62.5%	50.0%
Not at all	12.7%	28.9%	34.4%	16.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Count	158	149	32	42
Mean score	1.77	2.19	2.31	1.83
Mean				
Key: The nearer the mean score to 1, implies a lot The nearer the mean score to 3, implies not at all				

4.5 Social Change

reporters are hopeful that their situation will improve in the medium term with 71.7% identifying that they think the situation will improve “in a few years”, which corresponds with the community response of 79.3% however in general the community sub-groups have a more positive outlook than reporters. Female reporters, reporters aged 18-30 years and disabled reporters are most likely to hold negative views: 8.1% of female reporters and 6.3% of disabled reporters believe that their overall situation will deteriorate in the future. However responses across armed groups are largely the same with 73.4% of LRA, 70.2% of WNBF, 80.0% of ADF and 69.0% of UNRF reporters identifying that they believe their situation will improve “in a few years “. 3.2%, 4.3%, 5.7% and 9.5% of the respective armed groups believe it will deteriorate.

Satisfaction with life to date is similar between reporter and community member with 33.2% and 30.7% of reporters saying they are satisfied and neither satisfied or dissatisfied respectively. This compares to 43.3% and 24.4% of the community. There is largely no difference across demographics in the reporter communities regarding dissatisfaction except that older reporters and disabled reporters are more likely to be dissatisfied which proportionally corresponds to the community.

On average the ADF reporters are the most dissatisfied with their life to date, followed by the WNBF. The LRA reporters show the highest level of satisfaction or neutral responses (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) to the question (40.6% and 36.9% compared to 29.5% and 24.0% for WNBF reporters, 22.9% and 25.7% for ADF reporters and 31.7% and 29.3% for UNRF reporters.

Respondents were questioned using a 10 step ladder response prompt. Their responses are tabulated below (table A33) and by mean score. The lower the mean score equals the responses state the reporter is closer to the bottom rung of the ladder, that is, where the poorest people tend to be. The higher the mean score equals the responses that the reporter is closer to the highest rung on the ladder, where the wealthy are.

Table A33. Comparative self-rating (food, housing, clothing, finances)

Consider a 9-step ladder where on the bottom, the first step, stand the poorest people, and on the ninth step, stand the richest -			H_30_1 On which step are you today in relation to food?	H_30_2 On which step were you one year ago in relation to food?	H_31_1 On which step are you today in relation to housing?	H_31_2 On which step were you one year ago in relation to housing?	H_32_1 On which step are you today in relation to clothing?	H_32_2 On which step were you one year ago in relation to clothing?	H_33_1 On which step are you today in relation to finances?	H_33_2 On which step were you one year ago in relation to finances?
18-30 years	Reporter	Mean	2.50	2.38	2.47	2.25	2.67	2.33	2.04	1.89
		N	157	155	156	154	157	155	157	154
	Community	Mean	3.63	3.04	3.37	2.86	3.73	3.08	3.06	2.47
		N	83	84	84	83	84	84	83	83
31-40 years	Reporter	Mean	3.02	2.65	2.63	2.22	2.95	2.64	2.42	2.18
		N	100	100	100	100	99	100	100	100
	Community	Mean	3.65	3.03	3.35	2.90	3.63	2.95	3.00	2.53
		N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Over 40 years	Reporter	Mean	2.82	2.81	2.39	2.36	2.72	2.52	2.07	2.15
		N	150	150	150	150	150	149	149	150
	Community	Mean	2.75	2.79	2.79	2.59	3.00	2.88	2.39	2.40
		N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	55
Male	Reporter	Mean	2.85	2.64	2.63	2.34	2.80	2.55	2.17	2.08
		N	306	304	305	303	305	303	305	303
	Community	Mean	3.34	2.87	3.05	2.68	3.44	2.92	2.78	2.29
		N	124	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
Female	Reporter	Mean	2.43	2.48	2.03	2.13	2.63	2.23	2.06	1.99
		N	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104
	Community	Mean	3.35	3.09	3.42	2.96	3.58	3.16	2.98	2.85
		N	57	57	57	56	57	57	56	55
Total	Reporter	Mean	2.75	2.60	2.48	2.28	2.75	2.47	2.14	2.06
		N	410	408	409	407	409	407	409	407
	Community	Mean	3.34	2.94	3.16	2.77	3.48	2.99	2.84	2.46
		N	181	182	182	181	182	182	181	180
Disabled reporter	Reporter	Mean	2.30	2.19	2.22	2.26	2.29	2.23	1.81	1.81
		N	70	70	69	69	70	70	70	70
	Total	Mean	2.93	2.71	2.69	2.43	2.98	2.63	2.36	2.18
		N	591	590	591	588	591	589	590	587
		Minimum	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1
		Maximum	Step 8	Step 8	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9

Generally reporters and community members consistently identify themselves in the poorest half of society (between steps 2 and 3) and within one step on the scale of each other with reporters being lower and so poorer according to their own perception in all areas

Reporters in the 18-30 year category see believe their situation has worsened in all areas (food, housing, clothing, and finance) in the last 12 months but not by a significant degree. Their compatriots in the community also believe their situation has worsened by a similar amount but also believe they have started from a higher point in the scale than reporters: nearly one step on the ladder. Reporters aged 31-40 years and over 40 years also believe their situation has worsened by a similar degree as 18-30 year olds reporters however not in clothing. Their comparative groups in the community also believe they have disapproved by a similar degree except in all areas. As with the 18-30 year olds in the community they start on one run higher than reporters. Female reporter sand disabled reporters identify that their situation has been most stable over the last twelve months as do female community members.

4.6 Summary

Overall the economic and social support networks of reporters are limited in size in comparison to those of community members, for example, 20% fewer reporters belong to social networks than ordinary community members and reporters generally have lesser numbers of good friends than community members. Reporters from the WNBF belong to less social groups than a year ago which may be a negative trend indicating that they are participating less in society. LRA reporters and ADF reporters show some social stability by neither growing nor declining the number of social groups they belong to over time. Lesser numbers of friends and the fact that female reporters in particular have a limited social circle and stunted social networks is a limitation on personal security and on psychological vulnerability as risks of isolation will increase in some cases compounding the trauma already endured as a result of conflict.

Reporters could be overly dependent on the family for support networks as 45.8% of reporters turn to their family first for financial and likely moral support compared to 36% of the community. This is particularly the case in younger reporters of whom 64.6% rely heavily on family and turn to them first compared to 47.6% of young people in the community. Reporters do also turn to friends who are not reporters but again at 15.3% this is lower than the community at 28.6%. All this indicates the degree to which reporters' social networks are more limited than those of civilians and so the function of those networks including socialization, economic support and psychological support is more restricted and there is higher risk of isolation and vulnerability for reporters than community members. Of particular concern is how 12.7% of reporters have no one to turn to for help.

Despite these limitations reporters and communities are very well integrated together and have broadly similar understandings of the dynamics of their communities. reporters and community members both hold positive views on increased trust and solidarity in the community and most reporters are secure enough to be open about their past. Reporters and community are strongly share the same perception of the high levels of diversity in their communities and while they both recognize that diversity and difference can contribute to conflict, the conflict identified does not appear to have anything to do with the wars of the past or with anyone being a reporter. The significant majority of reporters feel part of the community as does a similar percentage of community members.

Reporters and community in all demographics are generally happy and believe that have some power to make important decisions that can change the course of their lives. Reporters and community members

believe they have some control over decisions that affect their everyday lives and much more control and ability to make important decisions about their lives that could change its course.

However, reporters are self-critical and a higher number of reporters doubt their own contribution to their community. Also, reporters are significantly less likely to adopt leadership roles in their community in economic associations and are more likely to retreat from expressing political opinions alongside other community members.

In social reintegration female reporters are highlighted as most at risk of social exclusion due to them having a more limited social circle and stunted social networks. This can have a direct impact on on personal security and on psychological vulnerability as risks of isolation will increase in some cases compounding the trauma already endured as a result of conflict. Negative impact on security corresponds with female reporters being the sub-group that is most distrustful of strangers. When analyzed to take consideration of frequency of socializing the majority of female reporters confirm their isolation and weak social networks. Female reporters are among the most unhappy subgroups of reporters and are the group that most commonly identifies it is powerless to make decisions affecting everyday life. They are also the most politically marginal groups in terms of openly voicing collective opinions about common issues.

5. DDR Experiences

Following is an examination of reporter experiences of the DDR process. The analysis is structured to mirror the stages in the DDR process but takes account of the fact that the DDR process in Uganda has not been uniform and some of those surveyed were demobilized long after returning from the conflict. The analysis is structured as follows: (i) Reception and Return; (ii) Demobilization; (iv) Reinsertion; (v) Reintegration.¹⁵ The analysis also presents the reporters' evaluation of the AC, the support given by the Commission and the work of CFPs. As will be seen the experience of the DDR process and of the interfacing with the AC the state is highly varied between reporters but there are definite commonalities based on gender, age group and in particular armed faction to which individuals belonged. It should be noted that this section of the report contains more information in tabular form because complex issues pertaining to AC performance and disbursement of reinsertion assistance funds need to be comprehensively analyzed and tables provide a more effective and efficient way to present some of this analysis.

5.1 Reception and Return

Reporters returned after the conflict in a number of different manners. In some instances there were formally negotiated returns with the GoU, while in other instances the return of the reporters was informal, uncoordinated and partially ad hoc. The nature of how the reporter returned directly impacted upon who would receive them. Under more prepared or anticipated returns, agencies or organizations would be at the ready; whereas in less anticipated instances, many reporters would not be received by a formal agency or organization, instead they would likely be received by no one or by civilians such as family, friends or the community.

Overall, a third of the reporters (36.5%, comprising of the 28.5% who were received by civilians such as family, friends, community and the 8% that were received by no one, came on my their accord, then went home) whereas two-thirds of the reporters were received by an agency or organization (63.4%, comprising of the 44.6% of the reporters that were received by the army 6.1% by the local government or land councillors, 5.9% by the charities or NGOs, 3.4% by the Amnesty Commission, 1.7% by UNICEF, 1.5% by neighbouring government or army or police, and .2% by other structures).

Table 2. Receiving agency (by all armed groups)¹⁶

	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	UPA	UPDA	NALU	PRA	UPF
Reception Centre	87.4%	9.6%	45.2%	10.3%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Host family	3.8%	17.2%	.0%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Other	1.9%	2.5%	3.2%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Own home	4.4%	25.5%	41.9%	56.4%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Own family home	2.5%	37.6%	9.7%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Army barrack	.0%	7.6%	.0%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Count	159	157	31	39	3	3	1	1	1

¹⁵ This points to a methodological limitation of the survey: the fact that the reporters do not see the discrete stages of R D R R, rather they see the stages as leaving the bush and getting the AC package. So in order to overcome the disparities, the terminology was adjusted to reflect this. Another adaptation within the survey to ensure that it was tailored to the reporter audience was through the use of the word migration for migration.

¹⁶ Reception was coordinated by the AC.

The Ugandan army received 44.6% of the reporters. Of all the LRA reporters, a disproportionately high number were received by the army compared to other armed faction: the UPDF received 66.7% of LRA reporters, 30.4% of WNBFB; 37.1% of the ADF and 23.3% of UNRF reporters. The study found that 14.5% of the LRA reporters were received by civilians such as family, friends, and the community in comparison to 36.1% of the WNBFB; 25.7% of the ADF, and 55.8% of UNRF reporters. Of those 28.5% respondents that were received by civilians, a disproportionately large number of UNRF reporters were received by civilians rather than agencies or organisations, compared to the WNBFB reporters (36.1%), the ADF reporters (25.7%) and the LRA reporters (14.5%). Charities and NGOS are also important agencies for the LRA (9.1% received) and for the ADF (8.6% received) but not for the WNBFB (2.5% received) or UNRF (2.3%). For the WNBFB 13.9% were received by local government or land councilors compared to 0.0% for LRA; 2.9% for the ADF, and 2.3% for the UNRF reporters. The AC received 2.4% of LRA reporters; 2.5% WNBFB, 8.6% of ADF, and 2.3% of UNRF reporters respectively. The LRA are the only group identifying neighboring government, military or police as receiving them (3.6%). A small proportion, 2.4% of the LRA reporters and 11.4% of WNBFB, 17.1% of ADF and 11.6% of UNRF identify that no-one received them.

After being received reporters were placed in different locations or structures to facilitate the reinsertion process. Most striking about table A22 is that it shows how 87.4% of the LRA reporters were sent to reception centers (since as shown above 66.7% of the LRA reporters were received by the army), 4.4% were in their own home and 2.5% to their own family home. This corresponds with the analysis of reception of volunteers versus those who were abducted into armed factions: 57.8% of abductees were later received by the UPDF in comparison to 33.1% of volunteers. Of abductees, 21.3% were received by civilians on their return versus 43.5% of volunteers. The 87.4 % of LRA reporters housed in reception centers is in stark contrast to the WNBFB and ADF and points to the extra dynamics in the return and reintegration process for LRA reporters and the complexity of return to communities from which LRA reporters had been abducted and many committed violent acts. .

Most reporters felt good (80.7%) on their return with 11.1% identifying they felt bad and there is no important distinction across age or gender for these responses, or neutral (neither good nor bad) on their return (80.7%). When examined by armed group there is little difference except for the ADF for which 2.9% report feeling bad and 14.7% neutral.

5.2 Demobilization

The time between self-demobilization or formal demobilization and receiving amnesty is shortest for those reporters who were received by the military: 67.2% of those who waiting less that 12 months for demobilization were received by the UPDF, 73.4% of those demobilized 1-4 years after returning and 50.8% of those who were demobilized 5-9 years after returning.

Table A35. Time between SSD and formal demobilization

Time between SSD and formal demobilization (years)	When were you first demobilized?				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
0 years	12.8%	22.8%	11.4%	21.1%	15.2%
1-4 years	28.2%	15.8%	12.7%	57.9%	17.2%
5-9 years	23.1%	27.2%	11.8%	15.8%	17.5%
10-14 years	33.3%	14.9%	57.6%	5.3%	40.6%
15-19 years	.0%	15.8%	4.4%	.0%	7.0%
20-24 years	2.6%	3.5%	2.2%	.0%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	39	114	229	19	401

Reflecting the pattern of spontaneous self-demobilization and formal demobilization and amnesty there is a relationship between being received by civilians and waiting increasingly longer time for amnesty: 13.1%

(under 12 months); 6.3% (1-4 years); 28.6% (5-9 years); 41.3% (10-14 years); 59.1% (15-19 years); 66.7% (20-24 years). The percentage for 1-4 years likely reflects the visibility of Amnesty and the AC in communities and also the AC's drive to formally demobilize (give amnesty to) spontaneously self-demobilized reporters during the lifetime of the UgDRP.

5.3 Reinsertion

Reporters were asked about their expectations regarding a rehabilitative process upon leaving their armed group.

Table 3. Were you expecting a rehabilitative process as it happened?

	2008				2009				2010			
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes	46.7%	40.0%	57.1%	100.0%	36.8%	33.3%	26.7%	42.9%	20.8%	52.0%	18.2%	66.7%
No	53.3%	60.0%	42.9%	.0%	63.2%	66.7%	73.3%	57.1%	79.2%	48.0%	81.8%	33.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	15	15	7	1	57	15	15	21	72	123	11	15

Most reporters received demobilization and reinsertion and a small number received reintegration referral largely through the PRDP.¹⁷ Only 31.1% of female reporters, 41.9% of males and 42.6% of disabled reporters identified that their expectations (as they perceived they were entitled to) were met and did receive the rehabilitative process that they were expecting would be offered to them.

Table 4. Receipt of reinsertion payments (by armed group and formal demobilization)

	2008				2009				2010			
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes	60.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	68.4%	14.3%	93.3%	85.0%	25.0%	25.0%	72.7%	86.7%
No	40.0%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	31.6%	85.7%	6.7%	15.0%	75.0%	75.0%	27.3%	13.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	15	14	6	1	57	14	15	20	68	120	11	15

Less than half of reporters surveyed received reinsertion assistance from the AC. This includes 48.1% of the LRA reporters, 21.5% of WNBF, 79.4% of ADF and 83.3% of the UNRF. When asked specifically about monetary payments from the AC as part of reinsertion assistance 52.8% of LRA reporters did not receive any payments, neither did 99.4% of WNBF reporters, 20.6% of ADF reporter and 27.9% of UNRF reporters. While there is a risk that there may be some manipulation of responses by reporters possibly because the AC had recently completed its work under the UgDRP to service the backlog of reporters who had not received payments possible leading to a perception among reporters that there are more reinsertion monies allocated for those reporters who did not receive payments; this is still a worrying response with the LRA and ADF responses corresponding across the two questions.

As seen above there are high negative response rates for (i) receipt of any reinsertion assistance, and (ii) receipt of monetary reinsertion payments. There is a correlation between the amount of information received by reporters and the likelihood of receiving payments from the AC. In other words, it appears that if a reporter is appropriately sensitized then they are more likely to be able to navigate the reinsertion system better and access supports.

When analyzed by amnesty, formal demobilization and spontaneous self-demobilization it can be seen that those given amnesty in 2010 have the highest percentage who did not receive a payment an those given amnesty in 2009 have the lowest.

¹⁷ 4880

Table A38. Receipt of reinsertion assistance (by year of SSD)

Did you receive the Amnesty Commission package - in other words reinsertion assistance?	Time between SSD and formal demobilization (years)							
	0 years	1-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	25-29 years	Total
Yes	68.7%	59.7%	40.3%	22.6%	74.1%	100.0%	.0%	45.3%
	46	40	27	35	20	10	0	178
No	31.3%	40.3%	59.7%	77.4%	25.9%	.0%	.0%	54.7%
	21	27	40	120	7	0	0	215
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	67	67	67	155	27	10	0	393
	17.0%	17.0%	17.0%	39.4%	6.9%	2.5%	.0%	100.0%

With spontaneous self-demobilization and formal demobilization those who demobilized 15-19 years ago have the highest percentage for receipt of assistance which does not correspond with current analysis of the DDR program in the AC. Of those reporters who formally demobilized 10-14 years ago there are 35 reporters that received the package and of these 28 are WNBF, five are UNRF and two are ADF reporters. For the time period 15-19 years there were 20 reporters who received reinsertion assistance of these 16 are UNRF, two are WNBF and one is Solar-UPA.

Table 5. Reasons for non-receipt of reinsertion payment (by armed group)

Explain the reason you did not receive payments under the Amnesty Commission package	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
No information received on AC package	17.8%	27.9%	25.0%	25.0%
AC database errors	6.7%	4.4%	.0%	25.0%
AC ran out of funds	.0%	2.9%	25.0%	.0%
Government policies failed	.0%	32.4%	.0%	25.0%
Lost AC card or certificate	11.1%	.0%	25.0%	.0%
Missed disbursement date	4.4%	1.5%	.0%	.0%
No information from AC since registration	.0%	19.1%	.0%	25.0%
Partial registration	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Recent registration	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Slow & long process	31.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Still submitting forms	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Too late as AC process over	4.4%	5.9%	.0%	.0%
Waiting on AC / No information from AC since registration	17.8%	5.9%	25.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	45	68	4	8

Reporters were asked to clarify why they did not receive cash payments from the AC as part of their reinsertion assistance. Large portions of LRA, WNBF and ADF reporters have no information from the AC around reinsertion. For LRA reporters the main cause is the pace and duration of the reinsertion process which has prevented them getting payments. For the WNBF government policies receive the main blame followed by the AC not disseminating any information and for the ADF it is evenly distributed between (i) no information from the AC; (ii) the AC ran out of funds, and (iii) being unable to get payment due to lost amnesty certificates. The main observable finding is that there is great inconsistency across the root causes of dissatisfaction in reporters with the AC and the reinsertion process and it is surprising that this does not appear in official UgDRP reporting by the AC or review.

Table 6. Receipt of reinsertion assistance

	2008				2009				2010			
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes	60.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	68.4%	14.3%	93.3%	85.0%	25.0%	25.0%	72.7%	86.7%
No	40.0%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	31.6%	85.7%	6.7%	15.0%	75.0%	75.0%	27.3%	13.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	15	14	6	1	57	14	15	20	68	120	11	15

Less than half of all reporters surveyed received reinsertion assistance. Divided by armed faction it reveals that 51.9% of LRA, 78.5% of WNBF, 20.6% of ADF, and 16.7% of UNRF have not received reinsertion assistance. There is little difference across age categories but more disabled reporters received the package than those who did not: 65.37% compared to 34.3%. There is little consistency across armed groups when rating the quality of the reinsertion assistance they have received from the AC: Besides the AC reinsertion package 12.6% of reporters received additional reinsertion assistance (mainly LRA reporters 34 of whom received additional assistance outside the AC's reinsertion package)

A majority of 85% of LRA respondents rate it good compared to 35.9% of WNBF and 50.0% of ADF reporters. The WNBF tend to rate it as neutral (neither good nor bad) 46.2%, and the ADF are somewhat divided between bad and neutral 30.8% and 19.2% respectively. When analyzed via a gender perspective more female reporters than males identify the package as good (70.6% to 61.9%) with 9.8% of female and 17.3% of males identifying it as bad. The majority of disabled reporters identify the reinsertion assistance as good: 59.6%.

When asked to apply this judgment to the degree to which the primary needs of reporters were being met during reinsertion 17.0% of reporters identified that their primary needs were being met to a large extent' 31% to a medium extent and 52.0% to a small extent. There are similar response rates when analyzed by armed faction with the LRA reporters identifying 17.2% to a large extent, compared with 18.6 for WNBF reporters and 25.0% for ADF reporters. To a small extent is identified by 49.5%, 44.1% and 46.4% respectively. Female reporters have the highest percentage identifying that needs were being met to a large extent (21.7%). Similarly 23.2% of the 31-40 years old category identify their needs were being met to a large extent. Male reporters (53.8%) and reporters in the 18 – 30 year old category (57.7%) have the highest percentage identifying that essential needs were only met to a small extent.

Officially the total value of reinsertion payments is 28,800 UGX for backlog reporters and up 28,800 UGX including the value of materials such as seedlings and agricultural equipment for all other reporters. 78.9% of LRA reporters and 69.2% of ADF reporters identify that the total value of the reinsertion payments received was between 260,000 and 263,000 UGX. All WNBF reporters identify that their reinsertion payment was 350,000 UGX. The largest payments were during 2011 (mean of 256,166.67 UGX) compared to the smallest during 2009 (mean of 217,267.61 UGX). 16.2% of reporters indicated receiving UGX 100,000 which appears to be a partial payment. On average reporters waited for 4.3 months for payment and 13.6% waited a year or more for payment (mainly LRA and some ADF). Gender has no significant impact on the analysis but the average payment to female reporters is still less than their male counterparts. More influential variables are age and disability: reporters over 40 years of age receive smaller payments (the mean is just over 130,000 UGX) than other aged group and disabled reporters have a shorter waiting time for receipt of reinsertion payments : 2.8 months. Ultimately the armed faction to which the reporter belonged is the prime determinant of how long it took to get reinsertion payment.¹⁸

¹⁸ The AC comments that during the implementation of UgDRP, the re-insertion package was composed of a cash payment and physical items and tools. Each reporter received a cash payment of UGX 263,000 paid as a lump sum. This payment was composed of transport (UGX 20,000) and reporter's resettlement and support fund (UGX 243,000). In addition to the cash package, each reporter also received physical resettlement items consisting of both agricultural and domestic items. These included 3 hoes, a mattress, a blanket, a jerry can, a basin, 2 sauce pans, 2

5.3.1 Use of Reinsertion Payment

Table 7. Use of reinsertion assistance

Use of AC Reinsertion Assistance	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent	
Purchase food stuffs	52	17.6%	37.4%
Purchase poultry	5	1.7%	3.6%
Purchase livestock, excl poultry	30	10.2%	21.6%
To help or give to family, parents, spouse, partner	19	6.4%	13.7%
Invested in income generating activity	29	9.8%	20.9%
Purchase equipment	5	1.7%	3.6%
Investment in stocks and shares	1	.3%	.7%
Save, put in bank or saving scheme	4	1.4%	2.9%
Got married, used it towards engagement	4	1.4%	2.9%
For rent of house or living structure	8	2.7%	5.8%
Used it to improve or build a house, shelter	5	1.7%	3.6%
Purchase land	1	.3%	.7%
Rent land	1	.3%	.7%
Used it for children schooling	28	9.5%	20.1%
Pay for transport	21	7.1%	15.1%
Clothing	50	16.9%	36.0%
Leisure	2	.7%	1.4%
Mattress and bed sheets	3	1.0%	2.2%
Medical treatments for household member	10	3.4%	7.2%
Agricultural production such as pesticides, weeding, bush clearing, digging, ploughing	15	5.1%	10.8%
Food & live stock	1	.3%	.7%
Assist family	1	.3%	.7%
Total	295	100.0%	212.2%

Reporters were offered limited responses to identify the main use of reinsertion payments and there were clear differences in how reporters from different armed factions used their payment.¹⁹ Following addressed the top six uses per armed group: 38.4% of reporters from the LRA indicated that they spent some on clothing; 35.6% to purchase food stuff; 31.5% to purchase livestock or poultry; 26.0% to invest in an IGA; 21.9% gave some to parents, family or spouse to assist them, and 13.7% to pay for transport. 100% of WNBFB reporters spent all their payment on an IGA. 53.8 of ADF reporters spent some on purchasing foodstuff, 42.3% on clothing; 19.2% on schooling for their children; 15.4% on rent; 15.4% on transport, and 11.5% on an IGA. 45.2% of UNRF reporters spent some on schooling for their children; 32.3% on agricultural production; 29.0% on food stuffs; 25.8% on clothing; 16.1% on transport, and 16.1% on purchasing livestock (excluding poultry).

Applying a gender analysis 43.2% of female reporters spent some of their reinsertion payment on clothes compared to 33.3% of males; 29.7% on purchase of food compared to 40.2% of males; 27.0% on schooling for children compared to 17.6% of males; 18.9% gave some to parents, family or spouse compared to 11.8% of males and 18.9% invested in an IGA compared to 21.6% of males.

plates, a cup, 5kg package of maize seeds, and 5kg package of beans seeds. All reporters received the same package. No partial payments were done under UgDRP. AC has never paid 28,800 UGX as a re-insertion package at any one time. However, it should be noted that during the second phase of UgDRP implementation, it was agreed with the World Bank that backlog reporters be given all their re-insertion package in cash since they had already settled in the community and to reduce logistical costs like physical item storage and transportations. Thus the backlog reporter was paid only a total of UGX 427,409. Nevertheless, the trickle-in reporters continued receiving their re-insertion package both in cash and physical items and tools as before. Therefore the differences in cash amount from reporter to reporter should not arise. It needs to be noted that AC sometimes gives other assistance to reporters in form of training, startup-capital (e.g. 120,000 UGX under PRDP), tools and some allowances like transport refund. In addition, other AC partners and NGOs like IOM sometimes give assistance to reporters. Also some reporters like UNRF II have in the past received different assistance negotiated directly with government.

¹⁹ Reporters could select up to six answers per respondent.

As part of the demobilization, reinsertion and reintegration processes, the AC sensitizes or facilitates the sensitization of reporters on various issues. Less than 50% of reporters attended the presentations under the six categories of information about which they were asked. When cross tabulated with armed group it can be seen that LRA reporters are the least sensitized of all despite the majority being held in easily accessible locations (reception centers).

Table A42. Participation in return and reconciliation activities (by armed group)

After you went through the Amnesty Commission package, did you participate in any of the listed activities -		LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Traditional ceremony	Yes, many times	12.5%	19.9%	8.8%	.0%
	Yes, once only	43.1%	15.8%	11.8%	15.4%
	No, none	44.4%	64.4%	79.4%	84.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		160	146	34	39
Religious ceremony	Yes, many times	9.9%	30.6%	8.8%	25.0%
	Yes, once only	36.6%	22.4%	29.4%	22.5%
	No, none	53.4%	46.9%	61.8%	52.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		161	147	34	40
Welcome celebrations	Yes, many times	2.5%	7.5%	5.9%	7.9%
	Yes, once only	22.6%	21.2%	41.2%	13.2%
	No, none	74.8%	71.2%	52.9%	78.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		159	146	34	38

The negative feedback from reporters continues when reporters are asked about whether they received sufficient information on the reinsertion package: 30.3% of reporters received no information (including of 34.8% LRA, 38.1% WNBF, and 11.4% ADF and 5.0% UNRF reporters); 50.5% received insufficient information (54.0% LRA, 43.2% WNBF; 37.1% ADF and 70.0% UNRF), and 19.0% received sufficient information (11.2% LRA, 18.1% WNBF and 51.4% ADF and 25.0% UNRF)

This would suggest that the volume, content and methodology employed with ADF reporters could be a good model to be used with other reporters and could inform AC communications strategies. The date of demobilization has a bearing on the amount of information given to reporters: for those demobilized during 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 20.5%, 22.2%, 37.1% and 31.6% received no information. There should be no variation as the dialogue and reconciliation sub-component of the UgDRP which was effectively discontinued in 2010 did not target reinsertion activities and so the volume of activities directed at reporters should not have changed significantly.

When asked to rate satisfaction with the AC reinsertion package the rate of satisfaction improves as reporters receive payments. Of those who received payment 73.8% rate the package good, 12.1% neither good nor bad and 14.2% bad compared with 34.0% good, 46.8% neither good nor bad and 19.1% bad for those who did not receive payments.

The reinsertion package, particularly the level of payment is set so as to provide for immediate needs of reporters and the size of the package and the accompanying community sensitization strategy should mitigate against the receipt of the package causing conflict between reporters and community members which can occur when reinsertion payments are perceived as a reward to ex-combatants in post-conflict situations. Similarly, conflict can occur between reporters and family, sometimes as a result of the drivers above and sometimes as a result of the family seizing the reporter's reinsertion package. In Uganda only 9.2% of reporters (24 individuals in this sample) who received a reinsertion package from the AC related problems with family occurring at least partially as a result. This percentage is composed of 15.2% female reporters and 7.2% male reporter with the 18-30 year old age category and disabled reporters returning

the highest percentages in sub-categories: 14.7% and 15.8% respectively. Explaining further reporters identified the following as the top six drivers of conflict with their family (driver ii, iii and iv are similar and could be collapsed into one response, as could response v and vi): (i) family wanted to seize reinsertion payments (18.2%); (ii) accusation that payment to reporters is unfair (13.6%); (iii) had to share payment with the family (9.1%); (iv) my family accused me of seeking free handouts from the government; (v) I was undermined and ridiculed, and (vi) attacked by my neighbors for being a reporter.

5.3.2. Reporters' experience of the AC

While the experience of reporters in reinsertion particularly around sensitization and reinsertion packages reflect on the AC however reporters also fed back directly about the AC. Reporters rated satisfaction with (i) preparation for demobilization; (ii) the content of the reinsertion package; (iii) the reinsertion payment (cash) given by the AC; (iii) local AC office work in relation to reinsertion process. Regarding demobilization of those who received the package 63.7% of supporters were satisfied and 16.1% dissatisfied with the preparation of reporters for demobilization. A majority of 53.3% was satisfied and 20.2% dissatisfied with the content of the reintegration package given by the AC. The study found that 41.3% were satisfied and 44.3% were dissatisfied with the cash component of the AC reinsertion package. A majority of 51.6% was satisfied with the local regional office administration of the reinsertion process and 31.5% were dissatisfied.

Across gender and age categories there are strong variances in satisfaction ratings. Regarding demobilization there is little variance by gender but as the age category increases less reporters are satisfied: in the 18-30 year category 70.9% are satisfied 10.6% are dissatisfied; in the 31-40 year category 62.5% are satisfied 17.7% are dissatisfied, and in the over 40 years category 56.0% are satisfied 21.3% are dissatisfied. Similarly regarding the content of the reinsertion package across the same age categories the satisfaction rates are as follows: in the 18-30 year category 64.0% are satisfied 10.8% are dissatisfied; in the 31-40 year category 53.3% are satisfied 21.7% are dissatisfied, and in the over 40 years category 40.8% are satisfied 29.6% are dissatisfied. Regarding the cash component of the reinsertion package in the 18-30 year category 56.3% are satisfied 24.0% are dissatisfied; in the 31-40 year category 44.6% are satisfied 44.6% are dissatisfied, and in the over 40 years category 19.5% are satisfied 70.1% are dissatisfied. Regarding the work by the regional AC office: in the 18-30 year category 69.8% are satisfied 15.8% are dissatisfied; in the 31-40 year category 64.2% are satisfied 26.9% are dissatisfied, and in the over 40 years category 19.0% are satisfied 55.2% are dissatisfied.

Regarding gender there is approximate parity in satisfaction and dissatisfaction rates in female and male reporters for: (i) preparation for demobilization and (ii) work of regional AC offices. Disparities exist in relation to the content of the reinsertion package where 60.3% of female reporters in comparison to 50.8% of males are satisfied and 13.7% dissatisfied compared to 22.6% of males. Disparities also exist regarding the cash component of the reinsertion package where 52.6% of female reporters and 37.6% of male reporters are satisfied with the component and 29.8% of female reporters are dissatisfied compared to 49.1% of male reporters. Throughout each aspect of reinsertion approximately disability is also a factor. Approximately 50% of disabled reporters are satisfied with each aspect but the most dissatisfied reporters are in relation to the cash component of the reinsertion package (37.5%) and in relation to the work of the regional AC office during the reinsertion process (27.9%). Overall the WNBFB reporters had the highest dissatisfaction rate followed by UNRF reporters. The year of demobilization with the most dissatisfied reporters is 2010 with 77% of all the dissatisfied. 2010 is the year when most demobilizations are likely to be backlogged reporters some of whom were outside the time period to receive payments. It is possible that the 76% is composed of older WNBFB and UNRF reporters who had waited between 15 – 20 years for demobilization and so received no reinsertion assistance: hence the root cause of dissatisfaction.

5.3.3 Reporters' experience with CFPs

The study found that 52.2% of reporters have interacted with CFPs consisting of 45.0% female reporters and 52.8% male reporters. Older reporters over 40 years of age and those from the ADF (61.2% and 57.1% respectively) are most likely to have had contact with CFPs and reporters aged 31-40 and those from the LRA least likely (41.5% and 44.1% respectively). 53.7% of disabled reporters have also had contact. Approximately 75% of reporters responded to rate the CFP's involvement in the reintegration process in their community with 80.8% identifying that their involvement was good, 14.0% that it was neither good nor bad and 4% that it was bad. The LRA and WNBF reporters rated the involvement of the CFP similarly: 54.9% of LRA that the involvement was good; 24.8% that it was neither good nor bad and 20.4% that it was bad compared to 44.8%, 27.6% and 27.6% from the WNBF reporters. The ADF reporters rated CFP contribution to reintegration the highest: 76.0% that it was good; 20.0 that it was neither good nor bad and 4.0% that it was bad. There is nearly perfect correlation between those respondents who said the community focal point was good at helping reintegration and those who had contact with the CFP.

5.4 Reintegration

As part of reintegration 14.2% of reporters participated in more than one traditional ceremony and 19.7% participated more than once in religious ceremony. Also 27.1% participated once in traditional ceremony and 28.9% participated once in a religious ceremony.

Table A43. Factors affecting reporters on return (from positive answers)

Did the listed factor affect you upon your return	Percent
<i>Proportion of reporters that indicated 'yes'</i>	
Violence, Insecurity, Community unsafe	51.5%
Feeling watched by the government	52.9%
Fear of re-abduction or being hunted by the rebel group	60.5%
Lack of Family or Friends	47.3%
Land tenure issues - i.e. no land or housing, or money for rental	40.2%
Destruction of housing or shelter	55.1%
Ability to sustain yourself - i.e. to feed yourself, to provide a sustainable livelihood for yourself and household	70.5%
Education - for you or your children	70.8%
Having to perform work that you were not used to or did not want to perform	58.8%

When considering the barriers to reintegration they encountered and the factors that affected them most on their return to their communities, reporters identified the above (A43).

Table A44. Factors affecting reporters on return (by armed group)

Did the listed factor affect you upon your return	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
<i>Only those reporters that indicated 'yes'</i>				
Violence, Insecurity, Community unsafe	50.9%	56.1%	60.0%	28.6%
Fear of re-abduction or being hunted by the rebel group	67.7%	55.8%	76.5%	42.9%
Lack of Family or Friends	37.8%	59.7%	60.0%	28.6%
Land tenure issues - i.e. no land or housing, or money for rental	34.8%	48.4%	57.1%	19.0%
Destruction of housing or shelter	48.1%	68.2%	35.3%	52.4%
Ability to sustain yourself - i.e. to feed yourself, to provide a sustainable livelihood for yourself and household	61.6%	79.9%	85.7%	61.9%
Education - for you or your children	57.9%	82.4%	74.3%	80.0%
Having to perform work that you were not used to or did not want to perform	37.4%	75.3%	68.6%	73.8%
Bad memories associated with your environment - Psychological Triggers	75.0%	58.4%	71.4%	61.9%

Feeling watched by the government	47.5%	56.8%	68.6%	38.1%
Average N =	163	154	35	42

Within this analysis the LRA (and so younger reporters rated high in: fear of abduction (67.7%); ability to sustain oneself (61.6%); and trauma/psychological triggers (75.0%), and violence (50.9%). WNBF reporters rated high in most areas but particularly in: education for children (82.4%); ability to sustain oneself (79.9%); having to perform work one was unaccustomed to or did not want to do (75.3%); destruction of housing or shelter (68.2%) , and lack of family and friends (59.7%). ADF reporters rated high in all areas (even more so than WNBF reporters) but particularly in: ability to sustain oneself (85.7%); fear of abduction or being hunted by the ADF (76.5%); trauma/psychological triggers (71.4%); having to perform work one was unaccustomed to or did not want to do (68.6%), and being watched by the government (68.6%). While not in the highest response rate 47.5% of the LRA reporters and 56.8% of the WNBF reporters also identified negative effects of the belief they were being watched by the government. UNRF rated high in education (80.0%); having to perform work on was not accustomed to or did not want to do (73.8%); psychological triggers (61.9%) and destruction of housing or shelter (52.4%).

The kind of exclusion and barriers to reintegration experienced by reporters is low level. It is rarely violent and more symptomatic of the rebuilding of ties with the community in the fact of uncertainty by all parties and the perceived caution of the community in accepting back some reporters. The study found that 26.2% of reporters felt some community members avoid them because of they are reporters; 30.2% that people are scared by them because they are reporters and 19.5% that some people in the community treat them with disrespect because they are reporters. The reporters of the ADF experience these exclusions more than the LRA reporters who in turn experience them more than WNBF reporters. These differences are understandable in the context of the timeframe since spontaneous self-demobilization or formal demobilization however it could be hoped that the WNBF would have even lower positive response rates. It was found that 44.1% of the ADF experience people avoiding them (compared to 34.5% of LRA and 19.0% of WNBF); 44.1% of the ADF experience people being scared of them (compared to 40.2% of LRA and 21.7% of WNBF), and 32.4% of ADF experience people treating them with disrespect (compared to 23.3% of LRA reporters and 15.4% of WNBF reporters). UNRF compare very favorably to other reporters with 4.7% indicating they believe people avoid them because they are reporters; 9.3% that people are scared of them and 9.3% that people disrespect them.

Table 8. Avoidance, fear and disrespect (by armed group)

Only the proportion of reporters that indicated 'yes'	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Do you feel that people avoid you because you are a reporter?	34.5%	19.0%	44.1%	4.7%
Do you feel that people are scared of you because you are a reporter?	40.2%	21.7%	44.1%	9.3%
Do you feel that people treat you with disrespect because you are a reporter?	23.3%	15.4%	32.4%	9.3%
Average N =	164	157	34	43

A dimension of successful or unsuccessful reintegration is the extent to which reporters break or continue to maintain ties with other reporters and former commanders. Studies from other African countries show that in spite quite successful demobilization processes of armed factions, former mid-level commanders (ex-MiLCs) continue to wield considerable influence over their ex-fighters. From the responses in this quantitative survey it would appear that reporters have very little contact with former commanders and to a large extent do no benefit materially from residual command structures. However, those structures do still exist: in the field work for this study former commanders assisted the field teams to identify and locate difficult to find reporters who had been randomly chosen for the sample.

The study identified that 70.6% of reporters never have contact with former commanders or leaders in their former rebel group. Female reporters have less contact than males: 80.6% have no contact, 9.7% seldom, 5.8% often and 3.9% always in comparison to males, of whom 67.2% never have contact, 19.9% seldom, 9.3% often and 3.6% always. The overall percentage of those who never have contact is composed mainly of LRA (88.4% and ADF 94.14%) with 55.5% of the WNBF responding in the same manner. A limited proportion of 10.4% of LRA seldom have contact and 1.2% often. Similarly 2.9% of ADF seldom have contact and the same percentage often have contact. 24.5% of WNBF seldom have contact and 13.5% often and 6.5% always have contact.

It is evident from responses that contact with former commanders does not convert into gains in employment of income generating opportunities: 93.3% of reporters state that they do not acquire income generating opportunities in this way, 4.6% seldom and 2.1% often. There is no variance across genders and age categories so little variance. The ADF do not benefit in any ways while 1.3% of the LRA do and 3.9% of the WNBF do also.

5.4.1 Reintegration with the family

As noted above reporters have experienced reintegration difficulties regarding their reinsertion package, particularly the cash component. However, in general reporter's families have been receptive and supportive during reinsertion and reintegration: 93.8% of reporters identify that their family was welcoming of them and 2.6% that their family was unwelcoming. There is correlation across genders and all age categories except 31-40 year olds of which 87.9% identify that their family was welcoming and 5.1% unwelcoming. Across the four main armed groups the 95.1% of LRA reporters identify that the family was welcoming and 1.2% unwelcoming compared to 89.7% and 4.5% respectively of WNBF; 100.0% and 0.0% of ADF, and 97.6% and 2.4% of UNRF reporters respectively. This does not transfer across to perceive trust families had in returning reporters perhaps reflecting the difference between an event (welcoming back) and a process (trusting). A majority 85.5% of LRA identify that on their return compared to before the conflict their family trusted them the same as before, 10.1% a mix of trust and mistrust and 4.4% mistrust. This compares with 83.7%, 15.7% and 0.7% for the WNBF reporters across the same responses and 63.6%, 27.3% and 9.1% of ADF. 85.4% of UNRF identify that their family trusted them the same as before and 14.6% a mix of trust and mistrust. There is parity across gender, age and disability categories.

Table A46. Welcome by family after demobilization (by armed group)

How did your family welcome you when you returned after demobilization?	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Welcoming	95.1%	89.7%	100.0%	97.6%
Neither welcoming or unwelcoming	3.7%	5.8%	.0%	.0%
Unwelcoming	1.2%	4.5%	.0%	2.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	164	156	34	41

5.4.2 Reintegration and the community

Reintegration in the community is more complex to measure in so far as much of the feedback from reporters pertains (i) to their own experience and (ii) then to their perceptions of the community and the degree to which the community has reintegrated with reporters as much as facilitated or supported the reintegration of reporters back into their communities.

As noted previously, 13.2% of female reports and 26.4% of male reporters have witnessed problems in the community that directly relate to the reinsertion and reintegration of reporters back into the area. 63.1% of reporters stated that the community was accepting of them on their return and this percentage when analyzed across the main armed factions reveals that 51.9% of the LRA believe the community was totally accepting of them on their return compared to 43.8% who stated the community was partially accepting and 4.3% who stated that the community was not accepting. The comparable responses by the WNBF and ADF are WNBF 70.5%, 26.3% and 3.2%; ADF 63.6%, 27.3% and 9.1%. Gender and disability appear not to influence the levels of acceptance except for the age category of over 40 years where 76.7% of reporters identify that they were fully accepted compared to 52.3% of 18-30 year olds and 58.8% of 31-40 year olds.

Table A47. Acceptance by family and community (by armed group)

		LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Was your family accepting of you when you returned?	Yes totally	92.6%	78.2%	84.8%	92.5%
	Yes partly	6.1%	19.9%	12.1%	7.5%
	No	1.2%	1.9%	3.0%	.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		163	156	33	40
Was the community accepting of you when you returned?	Yes totally	51.9%	70.5%	63.6%	82.9%
	Yes partly	43.8%	26.3%	27.3%	14.6%
	No	4.3%	3.2%	9.1%	2.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		162	156	33	41

Comparable statistics from the communities surveyed identify that when asked if their fellow community members were accepting of returning reporters relatives the community responses show a more positive perspective of acceptance: 72.9% identify that the community was totally accepting and 26.3% that it was partially accepting. The difference between reporter and community perspectives on acceptance is that 9.8% more community members than reporters in their respective sampled believe that there was total acceptance of reporters and 6.6% more reporters than community members believe that there was partial acceptance of reporters. A minor 3.2% more reporters than community members believe there was no acceptance. The differences between reporter and community could be explained partially by the perspective of respondents and overall there is a high acceptance rate.

Despite the high levels of acceptance many reporters describe their particularly experience of return, reinsertion and reintegration as more difficult for them than other reporters. Response rates are similar by gender with 73.8% of female reporters identifying that the experience for them was more difficult than for others, 14.6% the same as others and 11.7% less than others compared to male reporters who responded as follows over the same variables: 69.2%; 18.0% and 12.8%. Disabled reporters responded 71.0%; 13.0% and 16%.

The study found that 72.7% of LRA reporters believed it was more difficult for them, 18.2% that it was the same as it was for others and 9.1% that it was less. The WNBF reporters responded as follows over the same variables: 71.3%; 14.0% and 14.6% and the ADF reporters: 77.1%, 8.6% and 14.3%.

5.5 Findings

Regarding the DDR process and the involvement of the AC findings are disaggregated by stages in the DDR process and then by reporter evaluation of the AC. It is important to bear in mind that aside from how reporters may return to their communities the DDR process is not uniform for all reporters: the main variable is when reporters received amnesty.

Overall the army received 44.6% of the reporters. Of all the LRA reporters, a disproportionately high number were received by the army compared to other armed faction (with only 30.4% of the WNBF, 37.1% of the ADF and 23.3% of the UNRF being received by the army). Most of the LRA reporters were sent to reception centers. This 87.4 % of LRA reporters housed in reception centers is in stark contrast to the WNBF and ADF and points to the extra dynamics in the return and reintegration process for LRA reporters and the complexity of return to communities from which LRA reporters had been abducted and many committed violent acts.

Regarding reinsertion less than half of reporters surveyed received reinsertion assistance from the AC (this is likely to correlate to those reporters who were part of the backlogs given amnesty by the AC between 2008 and 2011). When asked specifically about monetary payments from the AC as part of reinsertion assistance 52.8% of LRA reporters respond they have not received any as did 99.4% of WNBF reporters, 20.6% of ADF reporter and 27.9% of UNRF reporters. 68.9% of female reporters and 58.1% of males and 57.4% of disabled reporters identified that their expectations were not met and a rehabilitative process that they were expecting was not offered to them.

There is a correlation between the amount of information received by reporters and the likelihood of receiving payments from the AC. In other words, it appears that if a reporter is appropriately sensitized then they are more likely to be able to navigate the reinsertion system better and access supports. Large portions of LRA, WNBF and ADF reporters have no information from the AC around reinsertion. The result is that for WNBF reporters, government policies receive the main blame followed by the AC not disseminating any information. For the vulnerable ADF the blame is laid at the door of the AC. The main observable finding is that there is great inconsistency across the root causes of dissatisfaction in reporters with the AC and the reinsertion process. Less than 50% of reporters attended the presentations under the six categories of information about which they were asked. When cross tabulated with armed group it can be seen that LRA reporters are the least sensitized of all despite the majority being held in easily accessible locations (reception centers).

However 17.0% of reporters identified that their primary needs were being met to a large extent, 31% to a medium extent and 52.0% to a small extent. There are similar response rates when analyzed by armed faction with the LRA reporters identifying 17.2% to a large extent, compared with 18.6 for WNBF reporters and 25.0% for ADF reporters. Gender has no significant impact on the analysis but the average payment to female reporters is still less than their male counterparts.

The kind of exclusion and barriers to reintegration experienced by reporters is low level. It is rarely violent and more symptomatic of the rebuilding of ties with the community in the fact of uncertainty by all parties and the perceived caution of the community in accepting back some reporters. The reporters of the ADF experience these exclusions more than reporters from the other armed groups.

Reporters appear to have divested themselves of command structures have very little contact with former commanders and to a large extent do no benefit materially from residual command structures. These are replaced with family support structures and in general reporter's families have been receptive and supportive during reinsertion and reintegration. Also, the community has overwhelmingly welcomed back reporters to become part of the larger society.

6. Conclusions

This study has found that reporters and community members in Uganda largely are successfully reintegrated. It has found that there are vulnerable sub-groups of reporters: female reporters, 18-30 year olds and ADF reporters that have particular reintegration challenges. It has found that it may be helpful to perceive these reintegration challenges first, through a wider development lens and second, through one that focuses on urban disadvantage. This would allow the barriers to social and economic participation that are experienced by female reporters to be at least partially addressed through future development projects such as those focusing on education, IGA and livelihood creation. In the case of the ADF it would allow the negative perceptions of peace and security which are held by the ADF reporters and which are likely to be linked to urban poverty to be addressed through specifically urban-focused poverty alleviation measures. However it is outside the remit of this study to apply those lenses.

It is not possible to isolate one driver of integration. However taking as a starting point the levels of trust, solidarity and acceptance in communities and in families it is evident that there has been a strong process of reconciliation and understanding that has empowered reporters to be open and transparent and which has enabled communities to be welcoming and highly understanding of the challenges faced by reporters as they work to gain economic parity with the fellow community members. This points to the principle area of reintegration where reporters face the most challenges: economic reintegration.

In Uganda the national process of dialogue and reconciliation is based on the principle of Amnesty and subsequent processes of reconciliation and forgiveness. While in this study the particular sub-components of the DDR process implemented by the Amnesty Commission get mixed appraisals by reporters the overall principle of Amnesty as administered by the AC under the Amnesty Act is likely to have been a driver of the very positive state of reintegration outlined in this report.

Conflict produces disintegration and fragmentation of family, communities and broader society and for reporters and community alike the challenge is to rebuild those fragmented networks and units that support how individuals, families and communities *are* in the world. For reporters the challenges are acute and include how to re-enter these fragmented networks and units that provide the pathways to social and economic reintegration and which when made whole and functional again constitute evidence of successful reintegration. Communities in Uganda through their shared understanding of the barriers experienced by reporters appear to have greatly eased this process or reintegration.

There is limited distinction between the level of reintegration between the main armed groups however those who have been inactive longer (and which have older reporters) appear to be better established economically and to be more confident regarding participation in the community and levels of stigma.

However it should be noted that reporters perceive themselves to be more vulnerable in terms of economic status and poverty than fellow community members perceive themselves to be. Despite this reporters (excluding female reporters) have a positive outlook on improvements to their economic situation in the near future and (excluding female reporters) have a level of self-belief in their capacity to change their lives that equals the self-belief in the rest of the communities surveyed for the study.

6.1 Land, food security and conflict

Reporters have successfully achieved an equal level of land access, land ownership and property ownership to that of their fellow community members. Reporters and community members broadly share the same dwelling type; the same issue modes of land ownership and have similar levels of access to arable land and livestock.

Where things differ for reporters is in relation to the experience of hunger and nutritional deprivation. Despite similar levels of access to land reporters are twice as likely to go hungry than community members. 21.6% of reporters live in a household where some members often go hungry compared to 11.6% of community members. 2.7% of reporters live in households where some members always go hungry compared to 1.1% of community members. It is difficult to explain the disparity however it is likely that there is a gender dynamic to the reporter food insecurity as female reporters are far more likely to be food insecure than their counterparts in the community or than any other sub-group of reporters (see below).

Reporters and community members share a positive perception of security and agree on key indicators of safety and the likelihood of a return to conflict. 84.6% of reporters and 79.4% of community members confirm they never hear gunshots and 16.4% of reporters and 17.8% of community members identify that a return to conflict is likely. Any conflict that has arisen in communities is evident to have been everyday disagreement and quarrels which are mostly resolved without resorting to violence. However a small cohort of reporters (12.4%) and community members (7.7%) identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument they would resort to physical violence to resolve the conflict. Female reporters are more likely to resort to violence with 14.4% as are 18-30 year old reporters (17.8%). These demographics correspond with the community sample where 8.8% of females and 10.7% of 18-30 year olds identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument they would resort to physical violence to resolve the conflict. However, despite this reporters have largely divested themselves of command structures and have very little contact with former commanders and have replaced these structures with the support of family and a diverse body of friends. Because of this there are grounds for understanding that there is a positive outlook for peace and security in the communities studied.

6.2 Economic reintegration

There is evidence that reporters have stunted economic networks and more acutely experience barriers to employment that are shared with community members. Despite this the trajectory of reporter employment since demobilization is positive and reflects that of community members since 2009. Reporters have a low unemployment rate at 9.2% but it is still higher than the community rate of 5.1%. The majority of reporters and community members are concentrated in self-employment agriculture (66.2% and 55.4% respectively) 5.0% of reporters study while 7.3% of community members do also. There is a correlation across all demographics between reporter and community members. What this shows is that labour market is not stratified in any significant way to either section off reporters from community or to have a negative bias against reporters.

Reporters and community members share common perceptions about the future improvement of their economic status and the only differences are in how 18-30 year olds in the community have a more positive perception than reporter 18-30 year olds. However, large numbers of reporter and community 18-30 year olds (70.4% of reporters and 85.2% of community) believe their personal economic situation will improve in the near future and both groups identify similar drivers of that improvement and to the same degree.

Reporters do experience more acutely experience barriers to employment including: (i) low qualifications; (ii) stigma; (iii) lack of education; (iv) lack of experience; (v) access to credit, however the community is equally conscious of the fact that these barriers are experienced by reporters showing great understanding of the challenges to be navigated by reporters on the pathway to full economic reintegration. Reporters appear to be at an earlier stage in establishing themselves economically as is evidenced by how they share the perception with community members of the threats to their economic progress and security but how

reporters emphasize access to credit much more than community members who emphasize ageing. This perception is realized in the poor access to micro-finance by reporters and the limited success of those who access financial services in securing credit.

6.3 Social Reintegration

In so far as reporters have stunted economic networks, they have socially stunted networks also. This increases the risk of marginalization and exacerbates risks to security and wellbeing for more vulnerable sub-groups of reporters, particularly female reporters. Reporters have fewer friends than community members but do have a diverse body of friends who are mainly not reporters. However reporters are likely to be over dependent upon family for social and economic support. This is particularly the case for younger reporters and overall the social networks of reporters are more limited than those of the rest of the community and so the function of those networks such as socialization, economic support and psychological support is more restricted thus contributing to the higher risk of isolation and vulnerability particularly of female reporters.

Despite these limitations reporters and communities are very well integrated together and have broadly similar understandings of the dynamics of their communities including positive views on increased trust and solidarity. Something that is likely to be central to reconciliation and stability is how reporters are secure enough to be open about their past. Reporters feel part of the community and are perceived as such by the majority of their community members

Reporters and community share similar dynamics of agency: they have similar levels of happiness and belief that they have the power to make important decisions that can change the course of their lives. Reporters and community members share the belief that they have some control over decisions that affect their everyday lives and much more control and ability to make important decisions about their lives that could change its course.

6.4 Vulnerable Groups

In the study the main key reporter sub-group that is vulnerable is female reporters.

In social reintegration female reporters are highlighted as most at risk of social exclusion because their social networks are highly limited and they are far less socially active than any other key group. As females the impact of this on security and isolation is significant. Female reporters consistently score lower than male reporters and their female counterparts in the community on a variety of indicators of vulnerability including: (i) education; (ii) literacy; (iv) health; (v) access to marriage and family; (vi) risk of divorce or separation as a result of partner being a reporter; (vii) confidence; (viii) being more over-reliant on family support networks than others. In addition female reporters are among the most unhappy subgroups of reporters and are the group that most commonly identifies it is powerless to make decisions affecting everyday life. They are also the most politically marginal groups in terms of openly voicing collective opinions about common issues.

ADF reporters also appear vulnerable. The samples in this study are drawn from peri-urban areas around Kampala and from rural Kasese. This was not a deliberate sampling methodology but it can be explained in part by either or both of the following points. First the field teams encountered ADF reporters who have migrated to Kampala more than other groups and second, Kasese where fighting was in close proximity there was abduction by the ADF in the surrounding peri-urban areas. The sample of ADF reporters hears gunshots most frequently (nearly twice as frequently as LRA and WNBF); lack access to livestock, land and agricultural produce and are more likely to resort to hustling and begging for food

than any other armed group. ADF reporters have comparably low rates of property ownership which in part may be because of their peri-urban location however it is significantly lower so that the group are the most land insecure or have the least secure tenure on their place of residence. Supporting this conclusion is that they tend not to own or have access to arable land elsewhere in Uganda and not just near their place of residence. Consistently ADF reporters identify a bleaker outlook on their future than any other armed group. They also have the bleakest outlook on peace and stability as 51.5% identify that a return to war is likely in the future. They are they reporter group with the highest percentage who feel unsafe in their environment ADF reporters appear most separated from the support networks that are slowly being rebuilt by other reporters in more close-knit and rural locations.

Annex 2

COMMUNITY DYNAMICS SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

1. Demographics

Following is a capture of the full demographics of the community sample for the study. The demographics are based on the sample parameters outlined in the introduction: two thirds of the samples have parity with the reporter sample and one third is selected to widen the sample and diversify captured opinions on reporter reintegration.

1.1 Demographics

In total community members compose 30.7% of the total sample composed as follows (gender and age) and from the following sample points.

Table B1. Demographics (community)

	Community		
	Male	Female	Total
18-30 years	51	33	84
31-40 years	29	11	40
Over 40 years	44	12	56
Total	124	56	180

Table B2. Sample points (community)

Name of sample point	Community
Kampala	0
Arua	54
Gulu	42
Central	12
Kasese	12
Kitgum	49
Mbale	13
Total	182

Because of the sample parameters the study had a large sample group and so a good variable for disabled reporters (70 sampled). The size of the disabled reporter sample exceeded the original sample parameters because of the prevalence of disability among reporters and how some reporters not purposively sampled for disability were actually disabled in reality. The community sample is much smaller as is the sample of disabled community members (9 sampled). There were great challenges sampling disabled community members and despite utilizing local structures and bodies such as the NUPIDU it was not possible to recruit additional disabled community members. While the size of the disabled sample is appropriate for an analysis of dynamics in the community a consequence is that it cannot be used to compare disabled community members to disabled reporters. Disabled reporters can be compared to the general reporter sample and to the community sample.

148 community members identify themselves as healthy, 12 community members have underlying health ailments and are unhealthy, 11 are chronically ill; 7 community members are disabled and undergoing treatment, 2 are disabled waiting for medical rehabilitation; 1 member has psycho-social issue and undergoing treatment and 1 has a disability form childhood.

The aspects of the lives of community members discussed in this section are key indicators of reintegration and relate to the basic units and processes in society: marriage the family, the household as well as to the health and wellbeing of community members. The usefulness of this is not just to get a control group against which reporter progress has been analyzed but it shows the stability or otherwise of

these units in society. It also points to how sub-groups in the community, particularly females, 18-30 year olds and older people encounter barriers (for example, difficulty getting married) and navigate these barriers. For reporters pathways to reintegration are available through the family, through gaining education and training, and through addressing health needs and this is also the case for civilians. As with reporters, to assess the level of integration of a civilian in the community they must be assessed against the core indicators above and against others contained in this survey. In addition there are some experiences such as the experience of having reporters return to the community that are unique to the conflict and which have an overall bearing on the health of the community as gauged as least in part by the level of cohesion and integration. However the base indicators around health, marriage, family and education constitute the starting point for measuring integration, social inclusion and exclusion, security and insecurity (including food, physical, psychosocial).

1.2 Health, disability, marriage and household

Female community members are significantly less likely to be married than male community members: 28.1% of females are married monogamous and 8.8% are married polygamous compared to 56.0% and 18.4% of males respectively. Female and male community members are more likely to be married than reporters and the biggest difference is between female community members and female reporters. 16.5% of female reporters are married monogamous and 14.6% married polygamous.

The study found that 5.3% of female community members are living unmarried with their partners compared to 1.6% of males. Female community member statistics are similar to those of female reporters (6.8% of female reporters are living with their partners but are unmarried) however male community members are much less likely to live with someone unmarried than their reporter counterparts (5.6% of reporter males).

Female community members like their counterparts who are reporters have far higher instances of divorce, separation and widowhood than their male cohorts. 3.5% of females are separated from their spouse and 10.5% are widows. 7.0% are divorced. This compares to 0.8%; 1.6% and 0.0% of males respectively. Compared to female reporters 14.6% of female reporters are separated from their spouse and 27.2% are widows. 1.0% is divorced. Similarly 31.6% of female community members are single, never married compared to 19.4% of female reporters. Male community members and male reporters have similar levels.

Divorce, separation or widowhood does not affect 18-30 year olds to any great degree. This compares favorably to the reporter survey where reporters in the 18-30 year old category have higher rates in all three surveyed forms of marriage breakdown: 10.3% of reporters are separated and 2.6% widowed compared to 0.0% in both areas for comparable aged group in the community. Older community members are far more likely to be divorced (5.4%) and less likely to be widowed (10.7% of over 40 year olds) compared to their reporter counterparts (0.7% and 16.8% respectively).

Community members are far more likely to be married to a civilian than a reporter with the most striking comparative statistic being between female community members and female reporters: 88.5% of female community members are married to a civilian (compared to 87.5% of males) in comparison to 54.0% of female reporters. Similarly 7.7% of female community members are married to reporters (compared to 3.4% of males) in comparison to 42.0% of female reporters. Between community 18-30 year olds of whom 5.6% are married into a family with reporters although not to a reporter, 0.0% of reporters are in a similar situation indicating some but limited intermarriage of community members into families with reporters.

Analyzing further the statistics around marriage breakdown including attitudinal indicators pertaining to whether or not those unmarried community members would hypothetically marry a reporter 56.8% of community members would consider marrying a reporter (compared to 54.2% of reporters). The reasons given correspond with those given by reporters.

While the response numbers are low (46 community members) their reasons are explained as follows: of male community members the highest response is that female reporters have poor linkages to the community. Also important is that reporters have stigma or perceived criminality. Stigma and perceived criminality are important for female community members and for community 18-30 year olds. Female reporters and community members aged 18-30 years also identify a fear of reporters as well as the unknown characteristics of reporters and poor links to the community as reasons not to inter-marry. Somewhat unexpectedly the reasons given by female and 18-30 year olds community members correspond with those given by male reporters.

1.3 Education, skills and vocational training

Community members have a lower illiteracy rate than reporters (19.3% compared to 37.0%) and 78.5% can read and write compared to 55.6%. Female community members have a higher illiteracy rate than male community members: 33.3% compared to 12.9%. The highest illiteracy rates are for community members over 40 years who have 35.7% illiteracy. Regarding educational achievement the majority of community members have some secondary schooling (41.9%) and 25.1% have some primary schooling. 2.2% have some higher education and 6.7% have completed higher education.

In vocational training and training 29.8% of female community members compared to 50.5% of female reporters, and 29.5% of male community members compared to 26.5% of male reporters had received some form of vocational training in the last five years. Comparable statistics for those received vocational training across age categories are as follows: 18 – 30 years community (30.1%) compared to the same category of reporters (33.1%), 31-40 years community (40.0%) compared to the same category of reporters (31.0%), over 40 years old community members 22.2% compared to the same category of reporters (33.1%).

The two most common types of training received by female community members was tailoring (47.1%); craft making (17.6%); and the following at 5.9%: agriculture, carpentry, computers, cosmetics. This compares to the following for female reporters: craft-making (34.2%); tailoring (26.3%); bakery (10.5%); agriculture (7.9%), and livestock rearing skills (5.3%). What is immediately apparent is that community members receive IT training where no female reporters received it and also the high percentage of female community members trained in tailoring compared to female reporters.

For male community members the equivalent has been: carpentry and joining (24.3%); bricklaying and masonry (13.5%); driving (13.5%); agriculture (10.8%) and mechanics, vehicle repairs, driving school (8.1%). This compares to male reporters: bricklaying and construction skills (24.7%); agricultural skills (17.8%); carpentry and joinery (15.1%); vehicle repairs (11.0%), and bicycle/motorcycle repairs (6.8%). The main difference being the training of community members as drivers compared to 2.7% of male reporters.

The study found that 69.4% of community members are using the skills in which they were trained compared to 60.4% of reporters. For community members that percentage includes 70.6% of females, 69.2% of males; 57.7% of 18-30 year olds; 76.5% of 31-40 year olds and 84.6% over 40 years. This compares to 54.7% of female reporter; 64.2% of males; 23.1% of 18-30 year olds with the larger

percentages reserved for 31-40 year olds (72.4%) and over 40 year olds (92.3%). 18-30 year olds in the community have a far higher rate of employment in the area of training in which they were trained.

Of those who indicated that they are not working in their area of training comparing community and reporters the barriers identified are: (i) lack of equipment and facilities (35.7% of community members compared to 36.0% of reporters); (ii) no capital to invest in the business (0.0% of community members compared to 16.0% of reporters); (iii) continuing training or study (14.3% of community members compared to 12.0% of reporters); (iv) existing employment does not require the skills acquired (14.3% of community members compared to 2.0% of reporters); and (v) had lost the tools or equipment to do the work (0.0% of community members compared to 6.0% of reporters),

Immediately evident is how community members are far more likely to identify that ill health or that they only use their skills socially or for leisure than reporters (7.1% of community compared to 2.0% of reporters). Also, community members do not indicate that capital is an issue where 16.0% of reporters do. Similarly community members do not indicate loss of tools as a reason compared to 6.0% of reporters.

1.4 Summary

In the demographics for the community sample the groups that emerge as important in the analysis of reintegration and of the comparative study between sub-groups of the reporter sample and the community are: females, those aged 31-40, and 18-30 year olds.

For female community members it can be seen that as with reporter females they are significantly less likely to be married than male community members. However females in the community (and males) are more likely to be married than reporters and the biggest difference being between female community members and female reporters. Female community members are twice as frequently married monogamous than their reporter counterparts. Female reporters are twice as frequently married polygamous, and they are four times more frequently separated from their spouse than community females. Female reporters are also twice as frequently widowed. However, female community members have far higher instances of divorce, separation and widowhood than their male cohorts. Compared to female reporters female community members have higher proportion married to civilians: female reporters are five times more frequently married to male reporters than female community members.

Female community members are less literate than males with just over 2.5 times the illiteracy rates of their male counterparts which is similar to female reporters who have twice the illiteracy rates of male reporters. However female reporters also have twice the illiteracy rates of female community members. In the community over 40 year olds have the highest illiteracy rates which are close to those of reporters aged over 40 (35.7% and 39% respectively). As can be expected community members have more significant educational achievement with a higher proportion completing higher education than reporters (6.7% and 1.0% respectively) and twice as many community members having some secondary education compared to reporters.

2. Housing, Security, Land, Livestock and Food Security

Following is an examination of the (i) the dwellings occupied by community members including pertinent issues such as ownership and land tenure; (ii) safety and security including pertinent issues such as prevalence of small arms and perceived safety, and (iii) land usage and food security including pertinent issues such as access to communal lands and capacity to cultivate sufficient food.

As has been seen regarding security, a litmus test of the reliability of the indicators is the extent to which there was high agreement between the responses by reporters to security related questions and those by the respective community.

There are various ownership models for dwellings in the community. The study found that 61.7% of community members compared with 60.0% of reporters own their dwelling and 7.8% identify that their partner or spouse own it compared to 7.4% of reporters. 17.8% identify that the family they live with (mainly their parents) own the property compared to 15.2% of reporters. 2.8% identify that their dwelling is owned by a non-family member and 4.4% by a relative or family member compared to 6.9% and 5.9% respectively by reporters.

When cross tabulated with marital status it is revealed that self ownership rates are as follows: married monogamous (74.4% compared to 69.0% of reporters in this category); married polygamous (78.6% compared to 73.0% of reporters in this category); cohabiting (50.0% compared to 70.8% of reporters in this category); divorced (75.0% compared to 50.0% of reporters in this category); separated (66.7% compared to 46.2% of reporters in this category); widowed (87.5% compared to 64.7% of reporters in this category); single child never married (14.3% compared to 33.3% of reporters in this category) and single adult never married (25.0% compared to 23.6% of reporters in this category).

It was found that 79.3% of community members compared to 75.8% of reporters identify that their dwelling has secure tenure. Analyzed by age and gender there is similarity in data across age and gender categories and similar to reporters community members aged 31-40 years peak at 87.5% compared to 81.9%. Differences between male and female community members are minimal and the most significant differences are between female community members (81.5%) compared to 68.6% of female reporters. However female community members and reporters have comparable levels of insecure land tenure: 18.5% and 16.4% respectively

There is parity across all demographics of community members indicating that their land has the same tenure as their neighbors. There is also similarity with reporters except for community members in the 31-40 years category of whom 70.0% identify their tenure as the same as neighbors compared to 81.9% of reporters in the same demographics. 78.2% of female community members and 72.6% of male community members compared to 72.7% of female reporters and 78.9% of male reporters identify that the tenure is as secure as that of their neighbors. A much smaller percentage of female community members indicate their land is less secure (5.5%) compared to female reporters (12.1%).

Unlike reporters community members tend to perceive their living situation as the same or better than their neighbors: 39.6% and 31.3% respectively compared to 33.2% and 13.2% of reporters. It was found that 22.8% of female community members and 35.2% of male community members compared to 13.5% and 13.1% of female and male reporters identify their situation as better than their neighbors. However female community members and female reporters have similar numbers rating their situation as worse (43.9% and 45.1% respectively). Across demographics community members rate their situation more positive or equal to their neighbors than do reporters. 28.6% of 18-30 year olds; 30.0% of 31-40 year olds and 35.7% of over 40 year olds respectively rate their situation as better and 38.1%, 50.0% and 33.9% as

the same. This compares to reporters who rate as follows: 10.2% of 18-30 year olds; 15.0% of 31-40 year olds and 15.3% of over 40 year olds respectively rate their situation as better and 37.6%, 33.0% and 28.0% as the same.

2.1 Safety and security

51.9%, 27.1% and 21.0% of community members compared to 49.6%, 34.6% and 15.8% of reporters rate their areas more affected, same as other areas, and less affected by fighting or rebel groups. 48.2% and 53.6% of female and male community members compared to 51.0% and 49.2% of female and male reporters identify that the area in which they currently live was affected by the conflict more than other areas. The correlation between community members and reporters exists across most demographics with the main difference being between young communities. 18-30 year olds community members and 18-30 year olds reporters have the most significant differences. 45.8%, 32.5% and 21.7% of 18-30 year old community members tend to identify the areas as more affected, similarly affected or less affected compared with 57.1%, 36.4% and 6.5% of reporter 18-30 year olds assessing the war-affectedness of their area in the same manner.

Despite the degree to which community members and reporters believe their area to be conflict affected 84.1% of community members compared to 85.9% of reporters feel safe where they live. A further 6.6% and 7.6% respectively feel neither safe nor unsafe and 9.3% and 6.6% feel unsafe. Comparatively drilling down into these responses the following is presented which reveals similarities across community and reporter demographics.

Table 9. Perceived safety and security (combined)

How safe do you feel in the area you live?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Safe	85.0%	88.5%	81.5%	86.0%	90.7%	91.4%	86.4%	78.9%	81.0%	85.0%	87.5%
Neither safe nor unsafe	8.8%	3.8%	8.3%	7.0%	7.3%	5.7%	4.8%	10.5%	6.0%	7.5%	7.1%
Unsafe	6.2%	7.7%	10.2%	7.0%	2.0%	2.9%	8.8%	10.5%	13.1%	7.5%	5.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	306	104	157	100	150	70	125	57	84	40	56

In the community sample there is similarity across demographics with the following percentages of female, male, 18-30 year olds and over 40 year olds identifying that that reporters increase security: 41.1%, 48.8%, 44.0% and 56.4%. Community members in the 31-40 age category give the lowest rating to the increase (35.0%) but the higher for the neutral response of neither increase nor decrease (47.5%). Apart from this category of community members the community and reporter samples correspond across demographics.

To compound the findings that community members like reporters perceive a very low security threat, firearm penetration is also low based on their responses. On average 79.4% of community members compared to 84.6% of reporters identify that they never hear gunshots where they live. This is composed of: 84.2% of females and 77.2% of males (compared to 79.6% of female reporters and 86.3% of male reporters). There is similarity across demographics and between community and reporters. The biggest variations are in the 18-30 year olds category where 24.1% of community members in the 18-30 age category seldom hear gunshots compared to 11.5% of reporters in the same category, however those who never hear gunshots are 73.5% of community 18-30 year olds and 84.6% of reporter 18-30 year olds.

Community members are marginally less likely than reporters to resolve personal conflict with violence. A minority of 7.7% of community members compared to 12.4% of reporters identify that if they were engaged in a serious argument they would resort to physical violence to resolve the conflict. A majority of 82.4% would definitely be able to resolve the conflict without violence compared to 73.9% of reporters. Unlike reporters female and male community members are equally as likely to resort to violence (8.8% and 7.2%) compared 14.4% of female reporters and 11.8% of male reporters. As with reporters community 18-30 year olds are most likely to resort to violence but still less likely than their reporter counterparts: 10.7% and 17.8% respectively.

Looking to the future a majority of community members and reporters identify that return to conflict is unlikely: 62.6% and 58.5% respectively. 17.8% and 16.4% of each group believe a return is likely. There is similarity across all age categories with those in the reporter sample concerning a likely return to conflict. In the community 16.7% of females, 18.3% of males, 17.1% of 18-30 year olds , 23.1% of those aged 31-40 years and 15.7% of those aged over 40 years identify a return as being likely compared to 18.6%, 15.7% , 18.4%, 19.8% and 10.8% in the same categories of reporters. The main difference between the two relates to the level of confidence or definitiveness in people's responses. Far higher percentages in the 18-30 year olds reporter category than in the community 18-30 year olds category rate the return as neither likely nor unlikely (41.4% compared to 26.8%).

2.2 Land usage and food security

Regarding land ownership 30.2% of community have their own land and have the title deeds compared to 40.7% of reporters. However, 50.0% of the community has access to communal lands compared to 28.0% of reporters. Also, 6.0% of the community has family land compared to 9.3% of reporters.

Table 10. Access to land elsewhere (combined)

Do you have access to land in another area, which someone else is looking after on your behalf where you currently grow food?	Reporter	Community	Total
Yes, family land – rural	20.6%	27.0%	22.7%
Yes, family land – urban	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Yes, non-family land – rural	5.6%	12.6%	7.9%
Yes, non-family land – urban	.8%	2.9%	1.5%
Yes combination of above	.5%	1.7%	.9%
No	71.3%	54.6%	66.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	373	174	547

A minority of 4.4% of the community have no access to land anywhere compared to 8.5% of reporters. As in the reporter community marginally more females have title deeds than males (33.3% and 28.8% respectively) but reporter females and male share higher ownership, particularly reporter females. In the community the age category with the lowest level of ownership is in the 18-30 year olds category which is the highest level of documented ownership in reporters: 23.8% compared to 58.6%. The highest level of ownership is 31-40 year olds which is the lowest in the reporter groups: 40.0% and 29.0% respectively. In the community females and 18-30 year olds have the highest numbers without access to land on which to grow food (7.0% and 8.3% respectively) compared to reporters where females are the highest percentage: 10.6% of female reporters; 7.8% of men and 6.4% of 18-30 year olds.

Table 11. Access to land (combined by age)

Do you have access to land in another area, which someone else is looking after on your behalf where you currently grow food?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
Yes, family land – rural	20.0%	22.6%	18.5%	18.8%	24.5%	18.8%	26.4%	28.3%	23.4%	37.5%	25.5%
Yes, family land – urban	.7%	2.2%	.7%	.0%	2.2%	2.9%	.8%	1.9%	2.6%	.0%	.0%
Yes, non-family land – rural	6.1%	4.3%	2.7%	8.2%	7.2%	7.2%	14.0%	9.4%	15.6%	10.0%	7.3%
Yes, non-family land – urban	1.1%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	1.4%	.0%	4.1%	.0%	1.3%	5.0%	3.6%
Yes combination of above	.4%	1.1%	.7%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.8%	3.8%	1.3%	2.5%	1.8%
No	71.8%	69.9%	77.4%	70.6%	64.7%	71.0%	53.7%	56.6%	55.8%	45.0%	61.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	280	93	146	85	139	69	121	53	77	40	55

An indicator of the comparative advantage of being part of the community group rather than a reporter is as follows. Tables B4 and B5 above show that the community members have access to land both in the community where they live and approximately half of the community members have access to land in another area. This means they have livelihood and survival contingency as if the land or crop or livestock fail in the area they live, they have the other area as a safety net.

Community members were surveyed on changes to land access to ascertain the degree of regulated land division (through modalities such as inheritance, division amongst children or giving land as a dowry) and the degree of unregulated division primarily through land grabbing. Most reliable is the responses by those reporters identifying that they have less land because one could assume that despite no reporter saying that they grabbed land on return some percentage are likely to have done so. It was found that 15.0% of the community identified that it had more arable land now than two years ago, 49.4% that they had the same, and 35.6% that they had less compared to 10.3%, 63.2% and 26.4% respectively of reporters. Female community members are less likely to have more land than male community members (10.9% compared to 16.8%) and community members in the over 40 years age group have the lowest percentage who have acquired land: 22.5% compared to 12.2% of 18-30 year olds and 22.5% of those community members in the 31-40 year old group. In comparison with reporters community members across demographics except for females and the older demographic have higher land acquisition but only marginally.

Of those community members who had acquired land 40.0% had done so by buying land as an investment (compared with 12.5% of reporters who had acquired land) and 16% to expand production of products (compared with 10.0% of reporters). A small percentage of community have more arable land than two years previously: 16.0% compared to 10.0% of reporters compose of 12.2% of female reporters and 9.7% of male reporters.

For those who had less land than two years ago, when asked to explain why the majority of community members and the majority of reporters identified that they had lost land through regulated division (47.6% of community and 51.0% of reporters). A further 23.8% of those community members who lost land lost it through unregulated land division compared to 16.3% of reporters. Also 12.7% of community members lost land because of abandoning it due to drought, climate change or overgrowth compared to

5.8% of reporters. Because of encroachment of urban development 4.8% of community members lost land compared to 11.5% of reporters.

In similar proportions to reporters 42.9% of female community members and 50.0% of males lost land through regulated division, 9.5% and 2.4% respectively through urban encroachment, 28.6% and 21.4% through unregulated division and 4.8% and 16.7% by abandoning. Where 3.8% of female reporters lost land because it was sold by late husband and 3.8% because of eviction, 0.0% of their community counterparts were affected by these factors. The age group most affected by land grabbing is 18 – 30 year olds: 32.4% of community 18-30 year olds compared to 55.2% of reporter 18-30 year olds relate that they have lost land due to unregulated division.

The study found that 66.3% of community members have livestock excluding poultry (51.8% of females and 72.8% of males) compared to 52.7% of reporter households (51.9% of female reporters and 52.9% of male reporters). Proportions across community dynamics are similar to those experienced by reporters but all demographics in the community have more livestock than their reporter counterparts: 62.7% of 18-30 year olds (49.7% of 18-30 year old reporters); 70.0% of 31-40 year olds (48.0% of reporters in the category), and 69.6% of over 40 year olds (58.7% of reporters in the category). 48.2% of female community members and 27.2% of male community members live in households with no livestock compared to 48.12% of female reporters and 47.1% of male reporters.

The main three reasons explaining the absence of livestock given by community members are the same as those given by reporters however the percentages attributed are somewhat different. The study finds that 33.9% of community members identify that it is because of poverty or insufficient resources (53.5% of reporters); 26.8% identify that it is because of lack of access to suitable land or suitable space for livestock (23.2% of reporters), and 17.9% because of crime or livestock stolen (9.2% of reporters). From this it can be seen that poverty has less impact community members but crime has more than on reporters. Female community members are less likely to live in a household with no livestock because of access to land issues than female reporter (16.0% compared to 21.3%) but female community members are more likely to live in a household that has experienced crime that prevents ownership of livestock (20.0% compared to 14.9%) as do male community members (16.1% compared to 7.2%). In so far as reporters are more affected by poverty in this regard female community members and female reporters have similar responses: 40.0% of female community members and 53.2% of female reporters live in households so affected. However, 29.0% of male community members and 53.6% of male reporters live in households so affected.

A majority of 58.3% of community members has seen an increase in livestock in the last two years, 13.3% have had stock stay the same and 28.3% have had stock decrease compared to 62.1%, 13.6% and 24.3% of reporters over the same responses. There are similar rations across community and reporter responses however it is noteworthy older community members experience the biggest difference with their reporter counterparts: 46.2% experienced an increase compared to 53.3% of reporters aged over 40 years.

2.2.1 Hunger

Reporters are twice as likely as community members to go hungry. The study found that 11.6% of community members live in households where people *often* go hungry and 1.1% in households where people *always* go hungry as compared to 21.6% and 2.7% of reporters respectively. In a complete reversal of the trend in reporter groups male community members are more likely to be part of a household with serious food poverty than female community members: 1.6% in households where someone always goes hungry and 13.7% in households where someone often goes hungry, and 46.0% in households where someone seldom goes hungry compared to 0.0%, 7.0% and 63.2% of females in the community. This compares with reporter groups where female reporters are most prone to hunger: 3.8% of female reporters are in a household where someone always goes hungry; 32.7% in a household where someone

often goes hungry and 41.3% in a household where seldom someone goes hungry. This compares to male reporters where the same breakdown is 2.3%; 17.8% and 46.7%. Across age groups community members are approximately half as likely to experience serious food poverty. 2.4% of community 18-30 year olds (2.5% of reporter 18-30 year olds) live in a household where someone always goes hungry; 13.3% (22.9% of reporter 18-30 year olds) live where someone often goes hungry, and 48.2% (39.5% of reporter 18-30 year olds) live where someone seldom goes hungry. 0.0% of community 31-40 year olds (3.0% of reporter 31-40 year olds) live in a household where someone always goes hungry; 10.0% (21.0% of reporter 31-40 year olds) live where someone often goes hungry, and 55.0% (44.0% of reporter 31-40 year olds) live where someone seldom goes hungry. 0.0% of community over 40 year olds (2.7% of reporter 31-40 year olds) live in a household where someone always goes hungry; 10.7% (20.9% of reporter over 40 year olds) live where someone often goes hungry, and 51.8% (52.0% of reporter over 40 year olds) live where someone seldom goes hungry.

Community members and reporters were surveyed around (i) frequency queuing for free food; (ii) receipt of charitable food donations; (iii) hustling or begging, and (iv) rummaging in rubbish bins for food. Across all responses there was similarity between community and reporter. Regarding frequency queuing for free food approximately 1% of reporters always do so across demographics but virtually no community members do. Similarly, approximately 1% of community members and reporters always receive charitable food parcels. No community members or reporters always rummage for food and approximately 1% of community and reporters often do so. Less than two percent seldom do so. Female community members are more likely to always hustle for food, more so than male community members (3.6% and 0.0% respectively). 5.5% and 14.5% of female community members often and seldom respectively hustle for food compared to 3.2% and 8.0% of male community members. In comparison to female reporters female community members are more likely to live in a situation where they must always beg for food (3.6% compared to 1.0%) however they are less likely to often beg or seldom beg than female reporters. This compares to 5.5% of female community members often beg compared to 13.7% of female reporters and 14.5% of female community members seldom beg compared to 22.5% of female reporters.

Overall, nutrition or nourishment has improved for 55.2% of community members compared with 36.9% of reporters. It has remained unchanged for 19.9% of community members compared to 37.7% of reporters and has worsened for 24.9% of community members compared to 25.4% of reporters.

2.3 Summary

Responses from the community survey show similarity across all demographics of community members indicating that their land has the same tenure as their neighbors and similarity with reporters except for community members in the 31-40 years category of whom 70.0% identify their tenure as the same as neighbors compared to 81.9% of reporters in the same demographics.

Regarding safety and the estimation of the safety of areas of residence 18-30 year olds community members and 18-30 year olds reporters have the most obvious contrasts. 45.8%, 32.5% and 21.7% of 18-30 year old community members tend to identify the areas as more affected, similarly affected or less affected compared with 57.1%, 36.4% and 6.5% of reporter 18-30 year olds assessing the war-affectedness of their area in the same manner. Despite this most community members and reporters perceive a very low security threat and identify that firearm penetration is also low. Regarding a return to conflict there is similarity across all age categories with those in the reporter sample concerning a likely return to conflict. In the community 16.7% of females, 18.3% of males, 17.1% of 18-30 year olds , 23.1% of those aged 31-40 years and 15.7% of those aged over 40 years identify a return as being likely compared to 18.6%, 15.7% , 18.4%, 19.8% and 10.8% in the same categories of reporters. The main

difference between the two relates to the level of confidence or definitiveness in people's responses. Far higher percentages in the 18-30 year olds reporter category than in the community 18-30 year olds category rate the return as neither likely nor unlikely (41.4% compared to 26.8%).

Comparing female community members to female reporters, female reporters have twice as high a percentage indicating low security of tenure on their land. 22.8% female community members perceive situation as the same or better than neighbors compared to 13.1% of female community members. Female community members are also less likely than female reporters to resort to violence to resolve a conflict. As with reporters community 18-30 year olds are most likely to resort to violence but still less likely than their reporter counterparts: 10.7% and 17.8% respectively.

Community members have access to land both in the community where they live and approximately half of the community members have access to land in another area. It is likely that households have access to land beyond just their current dwelling place because of regulated division. This means they are likely to have more secure and livelihoods strategies as if the land or crop or livestock fail in the area they live, they have the other area as a safety net. For those community and reporters who have less land than two years ago nearly half lost land through regulated division. More community members than reporters (23.8% compared to 16.3%) of lost land through unregulated land division. Twice as many community members lost land because of abandoning it due to drought than reporters but half as many members lost land because of encroachment of urban development when compared to reporters.

Regarding livestock all demographics in the community have more livestock than their reporter counterparts however the acquisition and loss patterns are similar to those in reporter groups. There are similar rations across community and reporter responses however it is noteworthy older community members experience the biggest difference with their reporter counterparts.

Regarding food poverty, community members and reporters were surveyed around (i) frequency queuing for free food; (ii) receipt of charitable food donations; (iii) hustling or begging, and (iv) rummaging in rubbish bins for food. Across all responses there was similarity between community and reporters. In comparison to female reporters, female community members are more likely to live in a situation where they must always beg for food however they are less likely to often beg or seldom beg than female reporters.

3. Economic Issues and Migration

Following is an analysis of the economic status of the community and correlations and relationships with the economic reintegration of reporters.

The analysis offers a historical analysis of the economic status of reporters and charts degrees of success in achieving economic reintegration and economic stability, the two not necessarily being the same thing. Conventional wisdom is that economic reintegration is essential for peace and stability. However economic reintegration in Uganda and particularly in northern Uganda is contextualized by the severe development challenges posed to reporters and community members alike.

3.1 Economic status and history

Community and reporters had a very similar employment pattern prior to the conflict with the main sectors being as follows: 46.3% were studying (42.8% reporters); 33.9% self employed in agriculture (38.6% reporters); 9.4% unemployed (6.1% reporters). In the community of those employed in agriculture, 36.4% of women were so employed, 50.8% of men, 30.4% of 18-30 year olds, 40.0% of 31-40 year olds and 73.2% of over 40 year olds. Of those studying 25.5% were women, 24.6% men, 43.0% 18-30 year olds, 20.0% 31-40 and 1.8% over 40 years old.

Currently community and reporters share similar employment patterns with 94.9% of community members economically active compared to 90.8% of reporters. 55.4% (66.2% of reporters) are currently self-employed in agriculture 1.7% are supplementing income through subsistence activities (1.2% of reporters) and 7.3% (5.0% reporters) are training.

Broken down by gender there is some small variations across genders with 5.5% and 4.9% of females and males being unemployed and 49.1% and 58.2% self-employed in agriculture (compared to 63.4% of female reporters and 67.1% of males self-employed in agriculture). For community member the biggest differences are in study and hustling. In study 5.5% of females are studying compared to 8.2% of males (compared to 2.0% of female reporters and 6.0% of males) and many more women in the community hustle in the informal economy than men: 9.1% compared to 1.6% (for reporters 3.0% of females and 2.7% of males). Also, community members are more likely to be employed in the public service: 5.5% of females and 6.6% of males compared to 2.0% of female reporters and 1.7% of males).

One of the most striking changes in employment status between community and reporter is that at the end of the conflict 6.2% of community members were unemployed compared to 5.1% now. For reporters this was 30.0% compared to 9.2% now. This shows two things: (i) that reporters have been successful in becoming economically active and (ii) that reporters face an economic 'lag' partially due to having to find work. As has been discussed above, reporters are more acutely affected by credit issues in most aspects of their life than community members. So while unemployment marginally affects reporters more than community the real impact is how the lost economic opportunity as a result of being involved in the conflict means that reporters are chasing to catch up on community members and develop the same level of economic security. Similar to reporters 52.8% of female and 58.4% of male community members (52.1% and 59.5% of female and male reporters) returned to their pre-conflict employment. Across demographics the major difference is between 18-30 year olds in the community and 18-30 year old reporters: 34.9% of community 18-30 year olds returned to their pre-conflict occupation compared to 24.2% of reporters. In many ways this is an indication in both samples of the transition out of training and studying. In the community 70.3% of 18-30 year olds were studying prior to the conflict and after it this is reduced to 43%. For reporters the same statistics are 42.8% reduced to 4.9%.

The four main causes of unemployment for community members are: (i) they are studying (55.6% of females, 57.1% of males compared to 15.8% and 36.7% of female and male reporters); (ii) lack of marketable skills (22.0% of females and 0.0% of males compared to 10.5% and 14.3% of female and male reporters), and (iv) lack of education (11.0% of females and 0.0% of males compared to 5.3% and 0.0% of female and male reporters). The striking comparison within the community sample is that approximately one third of women consider education or lack of skills as their barrier to education compared to no men. For female reporters the key barriers are in fact health and access to credit (26.3% of female reporters identify credit and the same percentage identify health). As was seen above female reporters have benefited significantly from re-training and training and it would appear that female community members are now more disadvantaged by the barriers addressed by those interventions than female reporters. Corresponding with the overall trend in reporter groups, credit is a main barrier and health issues largely acquired while in conflict.

While less than reporters 59.4% of community members believe reporters find it more difficult to get a job than non-reporters (compared to 78.7% of reporters). Across demographics community members are consistent with 64.2% of females, 57.4% of males, 67.5% of 18-30 year olds, 57.9% of 31-40 year olds and 48.1% of over 40s identifying the difficulty faced by reporters.

Community members identify the following main challenges for reporters: (i) no or low qualifications (65.6% of females and 52.2% of males compared to 47.0% of reporters); (ii) stigma or negative attitudes towards reporters (12.5% of females and 7.5% of males compared to 16.9% of reporters); (iii) that reporters are afraid and their own fear prevents them getting employment (31.0% females and 7.5% males compared to 2.5% reporters); lack of education (0.0% females and 9.0% males compared to 12.8% reporters), and (iv) bad attitude of reporters (6.3% females and 6.0% males compared to 1.25% reporters) Community perspectives agree with those of reporters on the major barriers (qualifications and stigma) however they diverge when it comes to the lower ratings

Community members like reporters believe their economic situation will improve in the near future (72.7% compared to 65.5% of reporters). Following the same pattern as reporters males are most optimistic (76.2%) followed by female community members (64.8%). 18-30 year olds are the most positive followed by those aged 31-40 and last those over 40 years who rather than being approximately 10% higher than reporter response as with the majority of demographics rate are approx 10% lower at 50.0%. Community members and reporters agree on the reason for seeing their situation improve except concerning government assistance with only 5.0% of the community identifying this as a reason compared to 12.0% of reporters.

Female and male reporters are quite different in their reasons why they believe things will improve in the future: Where they agree around the main drivers and where is near parity in response rates is: (i) improved agricultural productivity (30.0% of female reporters and 28.6% of male reporters), and (ii) improved or expanding business such as customer base or running multiple business ventures (13.3% of female reporters and 11.5% of male reporters).

Female and male community members agree to the approximately the same degree on the benefits of peace and security, improved prospects due to study, and working hard as reasons to expect one's economic situation to improve. Female community members emphasize improved agricultural productivity more than males 31.3% compared to 20.5% as well as hope for assistance from a third party or hope (12.5% compared to 2.3%). Male community members emphasize improved or developed business as a reason more than females (18.2% of males compared to 6.3% of females). This corresponds with reporters where 5.0% of female reporters identify government assistance compared to 1.0% of male reporters and 23.3% of female reporters identify hope as their reason for thinking things will improve, particularly hope for some form of assistant package compared to 8.9% of males.

For community the two key threats to future economic productivity correspond with those identified by reporters: (i) ill health or aging (31.9% including 38.9% of females and 27.6% of males compared to 22.6% of reporters including 27.8% of female reporters, and 20.5% of male reporters) and (ii) lack of financial support or capital (17.0% including 27.3% of females and 10.3% of males compared to 32.3% of reporters including 27.8% of female reporters and 34.1% of male reporters) 18.2% of disabled reporters). More than reporters, community members identify inflation and poor economy as a threat (14.9% including 16.7% of females and 13.8% of males compared to 7.3% of reporters including 8.3% of female reporters and 6.8% of male reporters).

3.2 Non-economically active community members on employment issues

When not working 9.4% (36.0% of reporters) rely on their family for cash contributions to alleviate their situation, 18.8% (32.0% of reporters) are directly supported by family; 12.5% (0.0% of reporters) sell livestock; 9.4% (12.0% of reporters) beg for money; and 34.4% (4.0% of reporters) borrow money; 6.3% (2.0% reporters) sell surplus.

Female community members are far more likely to be provided for by family than male (57.1% to 8.0% of males). 28.6% of female community members borrow in this situation as do 36.0% of males compared to 5.3% and 3.2% of female and male reporters respectively. 14.3% of female community members and 8.0% of males beg for money compared to 10.5% and 12.9% of female and male reporters respectively. Analyzing by age the most salient points to a comparative analysis are that far fewer community 18-30 year olds than reporter 18-30 year olds rely on family cash contributions (11.8% and 53.6% respectively), and older community members and those in the 31-40 year category are most likely to access credit to bridge the gap (54.5% and 75.0% compared to 11.8% of 18-30 year olds , 0.0% of over 40 year old reporters and 10.0% of reporters aged 31-40).

The study found that 67.5% of community members (and 67.5% of reporters) believe that they find it more difficult than other people to find work. This is composed of 77.8% of females and 64.5% of males with community members over 40 years old most likely to identify so (83.3%). It was found that 33.3% of females and 10.0% of males believe it is because they have incomplete studies or are still a student. A further 16.7% of females and 55.0% of males believe it is because of their low educational achievement and 16.7% of females and 0.0% of males believe it is because they have no skills. Also 0.0% of females and 15.0% of males believe it is because of a lack of job opportunities. 16.7% of females believe both that it is because they are ill and that they would have to bribe to get a job. In the community low educational achievement is the key reason identified across ages: 30.8% of 18-30 year olds, 75.0% of 31-40 year olds and 55.6% of over 40 year olds.

When looking to the future, 26.8% of community members (27.8% of reporters) identify that they have a good chance of securing employment; 36.6% (27.8% of reporters) that they have neither a good nor a bad chance and 36.6% (44.4%) that they have a poor chance. Responses are close to parity between female and male reporters. Broken down by gender 50 % of females (52.4% of female reporters) identify that they have a poor chance compared to 33.3% of males (39.4% of male reporters). Similar similarity exists between community and reporter sample across demographics. While response rates are limited similar the majority of community members and the majority of reporters believe that education is the key to obtaining a good job in the future and that lack of same is the key barrier. However less community members identify ill health as a barrier which is the reporter group's main barrier to future economic improvement.

3.3 Women community members on employment issues

Following relate to response only by female community members who are not working. 31.6% of females state they believe they are discriminated against in the workplace as a female. The same percentage feel discriminated against as a female when seeking work. Non-economically active community females indicate that those who are engaging in discrimination are: female co-workers (28.6%); female employers or bosses (28.6%); male employers or bosses (28.6%), and male co-workers (14.3%). Of all economically active female community members 23.2% feel discriminated against on the basis of being female in the workplace. Of economically active female community members 78.0% (36.4% female reporters) stated they had considered joining together with other females to combine skills for some economic purpose including 67.9% of females aged 18-30 years and 100% of females aged 31-40 years. The main reasons would be to secure grant capital or financial assistance (17.5%), to pool resources (12.5%), to assist with savings (12.5%), and for profit (10.0%)

3.4 Income, savings and access to credit

The study found that 44.8% of community members compared to 40.4% of reporters are the sole breadwinner in their household and 55.2% compared to 59.6% of reporters are assisted by others. The sole breadwinners are composed on 22.6% females (compared to 30.7% of female reporters) and 54.6% of males (compared to 43.7% of male reporters). As in reporter households the older community members are more likely to be sole breadwinners (55.4% compared to 50.7% of those reporters over 40 years old). More community 18-30 year olds and 31-40 year olds are sole breadwinner than in reporter groups (35.1% of 18-30 year olds in the community compared to 25.8% in reporters, 47.5% of 31-40 year olds compared to 47.5% in reporters).

Of those community members who are not the sole breadwinner following are the percentage of household income (HHI) earned by the percentage of relevant community members it largely equals that of reporters: 1-20% HHI by 24.4% (25.5% of reporters); 21-40% HHI by 24.4% (27.1% of reporters); 41-60% HHI by 26.7% (25.0% of reporters); 61-80% HHI by 22.2% (20.2% of reporters), and 80-1000% HHI by 2.2% (2.1% of reporters).

In order to meet household expenses community members and reporters engage in similar levels of borrowing: 21.2% rely on family money transfers (24.2% of reporters); 42.4% borrow (34.1% of reporters). 4.2% use past savings to meet expenses (6.5% of reporters). 29.1% break even at the end of every month (32.7% reporters) and 3.0% have money left over after meeting household expenses (2.5% reporters). When analyzed by gender it is evident that in general female community members are more likely to rely on credit or assistance than male community member: 51.9% borrow compared to 38.1% of males, and 25.0% rely on family transfers compared to 19.5% of males. They are also and are far more likely to rely on credit than female reporters (only 28.7% of female reporters usually borrow). Also, female community members are far less likely to break even than female reporters (21.2% compared to 33.3%) and where 3.4% of female reporters have money left at the end of the month but 0.0% of female community members do. This builds a picture of female community member's relative disadvantage to male community members and their financial disadvantage to female community members.

The study found that 22.0% of community members compared to 13.0% of reporters have applied for micro-credit from a financial institution This 22.0% includes 31.8% of female community members (compared to 10.8% of female reporters) and 17.0% of male community members (compared to 13.8% of male reporters). Age is a factor with community members in the 31-40 year category most likely to apply (40.5%) compared to 10.7% of 18-30 year olds and 21.1% of over 40 year olds. This contrasts to reporters where older reporters tend to apply for credit rather than younger: 22.1% of reporters aged over 40 years, 10.7% of reporters aged 31-40 years and 5.5% of reporters aged 18-30 years. More community

members than reporters were successful (64.9% compared to 53.8% of reporters). For community members this includes similar levels of female and male (66.7% and 63.6% respectively) with the 31-40 year old category being most successful (73.7% compared to 45% of reporters in the same category).

3.5 Economic associations

As has been seen reporters are less involved in micro-economic activities than community members as they have had their linkages disrupted by the conflict than community members. 55.0% of community members compared to 34.3% of reporters are currently involved in any micro-economic activities including 68.4% of females (39.4% of female reporters) and 48.8% of males (32.5% of reporter males). In line with prior analysis of economic activity community members in the 31-40 years age group have the highest membership of economic associations (75.0% compared to 45.1% of 18-30 year olds and 55.4% of over 40 year olds) where there is no distinction across age groups in reporter groups.

When considering the type of economic association to which community members belong, as with the reporter sample savings associations are the most commonly joined (70.4% of community members compared with 75.0% of reporters). Broken down by gender this is 90.0% of female community members, 58.8% of males compared to 57.7% of female reporters and 50.9% of male reporters. Nearly all female community members are members of savings associations compared to nearly half as many female reporters. This group is also the group in the community most income and food insecure. Given this correlation it is likely that female community members are at an absolute disadvantage and their household structure is problematic. Female community members are more likely to be the functional household head with responsibility for feeding the households and so they engage in credit and savings as essential strategies to ensure that family needs are met. However it also indicates the degree to which female community members are combining frequent borrowing and some attempt at saving to just maintain the lowest level of food and income security in the sample. Female community members are highly vulnerable, arguably more so than female reporters.

The remaining portion of associations of which community members are part are largely reserved for male community members: (i) farmers associations (17.6% male, 0.0% female compared to 7.7% of female reporters, 30.2% of male reporters); (ii) income generating associations (0.0% female, 5.9% male compared to 3.8% of female reporters, 5.7% of male reporters); (iii) crafts associations (0.0% female, 5.9% male compared to 0.0% reporters) and (iv) distribution associations (0.0% female, 5.9% male compared to 0.0% reporters). Similar numbers of community members and reporters are members of associations with a bank account thus confirming some degree of formalization (32.1% of community members compared to 28.1% of reporters with no difference in genders in either group). Regarding the composition of associations there is a strong contrast between community members and reporters: 36.4% of community (30.0% female and 40.4% male) members a part of associations that have a mix of members but are mostly reporters compared to 2.2% of reporters (0.0% female reporters and 3.3% male). 49.4% of community members (40.0% female and 55.3% male) are members of associations with a mix of both reporters and non-reporters not biased to either group compared with 91.1% of reporters (86.7% female and 93.3% male reporters). Finally, 11.7% of community members are members of associations with only civilians and no reporters.

3.6 Migration

It was found that 11.5% of community members compared to 18% of reporters have migrated in recent times. Of those who have migrated 76.2% of community (85.7% and 71.4% of males who have migrated) have migrated once compared to 71.6% of reporters (78.6% of female reporters and 67.4% of males). No community members have migrated twice compared to 14.9% of reporters (14.3% of female reporters

and 15.2% of males) and 23.8% of community members (14.3% of females and 28.6% of males) have migrated twice compared to 8.1% of reporters (0.0% of female reporters and 13.0% of males). No community members have migrated more than three times.

Table 12. Place of residence at end of conflict (combined)

Place lived at the end of the conflict	Reporter	Community	Total
District capital	2.8%	14.3%	5.4%
Town	9.7%	4.8%	8.6%
Rural-urban edge or periphery	9.7%	19.0%	11.8%
Rural settlement, village	76.4%	52.4%	71.0%
Isolated rural homestead	1.4%	9.5%	3.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	72	21	93

For community members the migration pattern is similar to that of reporters although the distribution of population to various kinds of locations at the end of the conflict (identified in the study as the first step or location before migration) is somewhat different. A majority of 52.4% of community members lived in a rural settlement or village compared to 76.4% of reporters. 19.0% of community members live in peri-urban environment compared to 9.7% of reporters. 14.3% of community members lived in a district capital compared to 2.8% of reporters and 9.5% of community members lived in an isolated rural homestead compared to 1.4% of reporters, 4.8% of community members lived in a town compared to 9.7% of reporters.

Table 13. Place of first migration (combined)

Place where migrated for first time	Reporter	Community	Total
Kampala	5.0%	10.5%	6.3%
District capital	1.7%	15.8%	5.1%
Town	25.0%	15.8%	22.8%
Rural-urban edge or periphery	18.3%	10.5%	16.5%
Rural settlement, village	48.3%	42.1%	46.8%
Isolated rural homestead	1.7%	5.3%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	60	19	79

The largest first shift for community members is within a rural setting: 42.1% migrated to a rural settlement or village compared to 48.3% of reporters. Next is district capital and town to which 15.8% of community members migrated for each location compared to 1.7% and 2.5% of reporters. Also 10.5% of community members migrated to Kampala and 10.5% to peri-urban settlement compared to 5.0% and 18.3% of reporters. 5.3% of community members migrated to isolated rural homesteads compared to 1.7% of reporters. So while mobility levels are similar overall community members are more likely to move to more established urban areas: District capitals, Kampala where reporters are more likely to move to a urban settlement such as a town and to peri-urban settlements. However, both groups are most mobile within the rural settlement environments and to similar levels.

Table B8. Place of second migration (combined)

Place where migrated for second time	Reporter	Community	Total
Kampala	5.3%	.0%	4.3%
District capital	5.3%	.0%	4.3%
Town	5.3%	50.0%	13.0%
Rural-urban edge or periphery	26.3%	25.0%	26.1%
Rural settlement, village	57.9%	25.0%	52.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	19	4	23

On the second shift community second shifts are negligible however of those that migrated 50% migrated to a town and 25.0% each migrated to a peri-urban settlement and to a rural settlement. This compares with reporters where the majority (57.9%) migrated to a rural settlement, 26.3% to a per-urban settlement and the remainder 5.3% each to a town, district capital and Kampala.

Table B9. Place of third migration (combined)

Place where migrated for third time	Reporter	Community	Total
District capital	14.3%	.0%	10.0%
Town	14.3%	.0%	10.0%
Rural-urban edge or periphery	42.9%	.0%	30.0%
Rural settlement, village	28.6%	66.7%	40.0%
Isolated rural homestead	.0%	33.3%	10.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	7	3	10

On the third shift as with the second shift community movement is negligible with two people moving to a rural settlement and one to an isolated rural settlement. Three reporters moved to a peri-urban settlement, two to a rural settlement and one each to a district capital and a town.

Table B10. Location of domicile at end of conflict compared to now (combined)

		Reporter	Community	Total
Place lived at the end of the conflict	District capital	2.8%	14.3%	5.4%
	Town	9.7%	4.8%	8.6%
	Rural-urban edge or periphery	9.7%	19.0%	11.8%
	Rural settlement, village	76.4%	52.4%	71.0%
	Isolated rural homestead	1.4%	9.5%	3.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	72	21	93	
Place where currently live	Kampala	1.4%	.0%	1.1%
	District capital	.0%	9.5%	2.1%
	Town	10.8%	4.8%	9.5%
	Rural-urban edge or periphery	13.5%	19.0%	14.7%
	Rural settlement, village	73.0%	66.7%	71.6%
	Isolated rural homestead	1.4%	.0%	1.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	74	21	95	

Full migration patterns can be mapped by comparing point of origin (place lived at the end of the conflict) and current place of domicile. The migration pattern is such that community members have largely left district capitals and isolated rural homesteads in favor of rural settlements, primarily villages, however not in any great numbers. For community members the result is that migration to urban centers has been largely balanced by migration to rural settlements and for reporters a similar pattern emerges but which may contain some limited return migration.

When identifying triggers for migration it is not possible to draw conclusive evidence from the community sample due to a low response rate however of those who do respond all females had a single trigger and half of males have one trigger and the other half had multiple. For community members the

people who influence the migration decision are far more diverse than the group identified by reporters. Of those community members who migrated 33.3% had no one influence the decision (84.2% of reporters), 33.3% identified family (47.4% of reporters), 33.3% identified friends that are reporters (5.3% of reporters). The remainder of the community sample identified circumstantial factors such as economic opportunity or government as a trigger.

Comparing their current to previous location both community and reporter have similar responses: 75.0% of community rate is as better and 25.0% as the same compared to 69.6% and 21.7% of reporters. Female community members are as positive as reporter females: 100.0% of both identify it as better and males in each group are similarly matched 66.7% of community males and 61.1% of reporter males identify it as better

A majority of 90.0% of community members (80.0% of reporters) have no plans for a further shift (100.0% of female community members and 87.5% of male community members compared to (85.7% of female reporters and 77.8% of male reporters). 18-30 year olds in the community are more settled than 18-30 year olds reporters: 80.0% compared to 50.0% have no plans to move at this time. 50.0% of female community members (20.0% female reporters) and 50.0% of those aged 18-30 (50.0% of 18-30 year olds reporters) believe they will return to their community of origin at some point. 100.0% of community members aged 31-40 (44.4% of reporters in same category) will return.

3.7 Summary

Unlike reporter groups many more women in the community hustle in the informal economy than men: 9.1% compared to 1.6% (for reporters 3.0% of females and 2.7% of males). Also, community members are more likely to be employed in the public service: 5.5% of females and 6.6% of males compared to 2.0% of female reporters and 1.7% of males).

One of the most important differences in employment status between community and reporter is that at the end of the conflict 6.2% of community members were unemployed compared to 5.1% now. For reporters this is 30.0% compared to 9.2% now. This shows two things: (i) that reporters have been successful in becoming economically active and (ii) that reporters face an economic 'lag' partially due to having to find work. As has been discussed above, reporters are more acutely affected by credit issues in most aspects of their life than community members. So while unemployment marginally affects reporters more than community the real impact is how the lost economic opportunity as a result of being involved in the conflict means that reporters are chasing to catch up on community members and develop the same level of economic security.

Female community members and female reporters differ around barriers to better economic participation. Female community members consider education or lack of skills as their barrier to education (no male community member identified this as a barrier to them). This compares to half that percentage in the female reporter population identifying those barriers. For female reporters the key barriers are in fact health and access to credit. This alludes to how female reporters have benefited significantly from re-training and training and it would appear that female community members are now more disadvantaged by the barriers addressed by those interventions than female reporters. Corresponding with the overall trend in reporter groups, credit is a main barrier and health issues largely acquired while in conflict.

This group is also the group in the community most income and food insecure. Given this correlation it is likely that female community members are at an absolute disadvantage and their household structure is problematic. Female community members are more likely to be the functional household head with responsibility for feeding the households and so they engage in credit and savings as essential strategies to

ensure that family needs are met. However it also indicates the degree to which female community members are combining frequent borrowing and some attempt at saving to just maintain the lowest level of food and income security in the sample. Female community members are highly vulnerable, arguably more so than female reporters.

4. Social Capital

Following is a discussion of aspects of social capital including those of social networks and family units. In this section the study presents a comprehensive of the social characteristics of the community and how these characteristics inform the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of reporter social reintegration.

4.1 Networks and sociability

As has been seen above reporters like other ex-combatants in post-conflict recovery belong to less social groups than their civilian counterparts. A further 39.6% of community members compared to 60.1% of reporters do not belong to a social group. 37.9% (24.7% reporters) belong to 1 group, 16.5% (8.8% reporters) to 2 groups, 3.8% (4.2% reporters) to 3 groups, 0.5% (1.0% reporters) to 4 groups, and 1.6% (0.5% reporters). Comparatively year on year community members have a minor trend in scaling down their membership to social groups with 16.6% being members of less groups than one year ago compared to 8.9% of reporters. Also 73.6% have the same number of memberships as do 85.3% of reporters. Comparatively across demographics there is no relevant difference between female and male community members and community members aged 18-30 years have downscaling at 18.7% and 31-40 year olds at 10.8%. Reporters in the same categories have 5.7% and 11.2% downscaling respectively.

As an indicator of the level of involvement in community development community members and reporters were asked whether they are on a management committee or organizing committee. The responses indicate that more community members than reporters are on management committees: 46.1% compared to 24.3%. Within the community sample 34.9% of females are in these roles compared to 51.0% of males. Still this is a higher percentage than comparative genders in the reporter groups where 18.9% of female reporters and 26.2% of male reporters are in these roles. Across age demographics the highest participation in these roles is in the 31-40 year category (54.3%) followed by the over 40 year olds (48.8%) and the 18-30 year olds (38.7%).

As noted above reporter social networks are sizeable but more limited than those of comparable community members. The study found that 74.3% of community members (64.7% of reporters) have “lots of friends” and 20.4% (25.3% reporters) have “a few, but good friends”. 5.4% (10.1% reporters) have “not many friends”. Female community members have less friends than males: 11.3% have not many friends compared to 2.6% of males (and compared to 16.5% of female reporters). Across age demographics in the community there is a similar level without many friends (5.1% of 18-30 year olds; 5.6% of 31-40 year olds; and 5.9% of over 40 year olds). Those aged 31-40 years have the highest indicated level of “lots of friends”: 86.1% compared to 67.9% in 18-30 year olds and 74.5% in those over 40 years old (and compared to 71.7% in the comparable reporter group). Female community members therefore have smaller networks of friends than males, and a similar situation to female reporters.

As can be seen community members and reporters have similarly diverse friends in terms of age, gender and educational achievement with just over a half of both groups having most friends with the same age as the respondent, two thirds of both groups have most friends with the same gender as the respondent and between one quarter and one third having friends mostly of the same educational background (reporters are the lower proportion of 24.1% compared to 33.5% of community members).

Regarding the family as part of the social networks, community members and reporters have the same level of daily contact with family (92.8%). Those groups in the community who most would like to increase the level of contact (quantity and quality) are 31-40 year olds of which 17.5% would like to increase compared to 14.3% of 18-30 year olds and 5.5% of over 40 year olds. 12.9% of females would like to increase contact compared to 12.9% of males and 7.8% of female reporters and 7.0% of reporter

males. In reporter groups the 31-40 year old age group is also the group with the highest percentage wishing to increase contact (10.1%).

Table B11. Economic support networks (combined)

If you encounter an economic problem, whom would you first turn to for help?	Reporter	Community	Total
No-one	12.7%	4.6%	10.2%
Family	45.8%	36.6%	43.0%
Friend that are not reporters	15.3%	28.6%	19.4%
Friends that are reporters	3.1%	1.7%	2.6%
Both friends that are reporters and non-reporters	11.7%	13.1%	12.1%
Community leaders, Parish Chief	1.5%	.6%	1.2%
Religious institutions	3.1%	.6%	2.3%
Formal bank	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%
Local indigenous credit-saving structures	3.8%	7.4%	4.9%
Micro-lending structures	1.8%	4.0%	2.5%
Other	.3%	1.7%	.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	393	175	568

As concluded above reporters could be overly dependent on the family for support networks. This judgment is made on the basis of how 45.8% of reporters turn to their family first for economic help, particularly younger reporters of whom 64.6% appear to rely heavily on family. In comparison to reporters the community has a far more diverse pattern of economic support. Fewer turn to family and more access official credit through credit-savings structures and micro-lending. Similarly less community members access charitable sources than reporters. This pattern supports the analysis that reporters are more reliant on family and informal borrowing than community members who have a more diverse and stable network through which they can access economic support.

Table 14. Economic support networks (combined, by age)

If you encounter an economic problem, whom would you first turn to for help?	Reporter						Community				
	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
No-one	12.2%	14.4%	11.8%	18.2%	10.2%	11.9%	4.9%	3.8%	6.1%	.0%	5.6%
Family	47.0%	42.3%	64.6%	38.4%	32.7%	44.8%	35.2%	39.6%	47.6%	31.6%	24.1%
Friend that are not reporters	16.6%	11.3%	9.7%	17.2%	19.7%	16.4%	27.9%	30.2%	24.4%	31.6%	33.3%
Friends that are reporters	3.4%	2.1%	.7%	1.0%	6.1%	4.5%	.8%	3.8%	2.4%	2.6%	.0%
Both friends that are reporters and non-reporters	11.5%	12.4%	9.0%	11.1%	15.0%	10.4%	13.1%	13.2%	11.0%	15.8%	13.0%
Community leaders, Parish Chief	1.7%	1.0%	1.4%	2.0%	1.4%	1.5%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
Religious institutions	2.0%	6.2%	.0%	3.0%	6.1%	7.5%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
Formal bank	1.4%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	1.4%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	5.3%	.0%
Local indigenous credit-saving structures	3.4%	5.2%	2.8%	6.1%	2.7%	.0%	7.4%	7.5%	4.9%	10.5%	9.3%
Micro-lending structures	.7%	5.2%	.0%	1.0%	4.1%	3.0%	4.9%	1.9%	2.4%	2.6%	7.4%
Other	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	2.5%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	3.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	296	97	144	99	147	67	122	53	82	38	54

Community members also have less risk of having no support networks in comparison to their counterparts who are reporters. Across all demographics more reporters than community members have no-one to turn to for support when facing a financial problem. In the community 3.8% of females, 4.9% of males; 6.1% of 18-30 year olds; 0.0% of 31-40 year olds and 5.6% of over 40 year olds have no-one to turn to compared with 14.4% of female reporters; 18.2% of male reporters; 11.8% of 18-30 year old reporters; 18.2% of 31-40 year old reporters and 10.2% of over 40 year old reporters.

Table B13. Frequency of social meetings

		Reporter						Community				
		Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years	Disabled reporter	Male	Female	18-30 years	31-40 years	Over 40 years
In the last week, how many times have you met with people in a public place either to talk or to have food or drinks?	0	36.6%	57.7%	58.0%	37.0%	28.7%	41.4%	28.8%	49.1%	44.0%	20.0%	33.9%
	1	9.2%	5.8%	7.0%	11.0%	7.3%	11.4%	16.0%	22.8%	20.2%	22.5%	12.5%
	2	18.6%	14.4%	14.6%	19.0%	20.0%	17.1%	13.6%	8.8%	10.7%	10.0%	14.3%
	3	13.4%	11.5%	8.3%	11.0%	19.3%	17.1%	16.0%	10.5%	13.1%	12.5%	17.9%
	4	5.2%	5.8%	3.2%	8.0%	6.0%	5.7%	8.8%	1.8%	6.0%	7.5%	7.1%
	5	3.9%	2.9%	1.9%	5.0%	4.7%	2.9%	4.8%	.0%	2.4%	10.0%	.0%
	6	3.9%	.0%	1.3%	5.0%	2.7%	.0%	4.0%	1.8%	.0%	7.5%	5.4%
	7	9.2%	1.9%	5.7%	4.0%	11.3%	4.3%	8.0%	5.3%	3.6%	10.0%	8.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		306	104	157	100	150	70	125	57	84	40	56

Sociability is assessed through the frequency with which community members and reporters meet socially, in this case, in a public place, to talk, eat or drink with other people. Not many more community members than reporters meet socially in this context: 18.1% have met once; 12.1% have met twice and 14.3% have met three times. The remaining 20.3% have met between four and seven times. Of the community sample 35.2% have not met anyone in the last week. This compares to reporters where 42.0% of reporters have not met socially in the last week. In the community of those who have not met are more female than male (49.7% of females compared to 28.8% of males continuation a similarity with the reporter sample where 57.7% of females and 36.6% of males have not met anyone socially in the last week). Also continuing the similarity 44.0% of younger people in the community and 58.0% in reporter groups have not met socially. The 31-40 year category in the community has the lowest rate for this response (20.0% compared to 37.0% in the reporter sample in this age group). A finding is how the 31-40 year old group in the community is socially as well as economically more established and functional than the equivalent group in the reporters.

The frequency with which community members meet is largely the same as two years previously and shows little difference to that of reporters. The study found that 29.3% compared to 21.8% meet more often; 48.3% compared with 56.9% meet with the same frequency and 23.3% compared to 21.3% identifying that it is less. In very similar ratios with the reporter sample more females have the same frequency as two years ago and more males have an increase. The largest decrease is in the over 40 year old sample of which in the community 30.4% meet people less than 2 years ago compared with 21.8% in the reporter sample (also the largest decrease in the reporter sample).

4.2 Trust and solidarity

There is little difference between community and reporters regarding trust. In all areas there is close to parity: (i) to the extent to which people in the community can be trusted; (ii) across the categories of people whom can be trusted in society, (iii) regarding explanation why levels of trust have changed. The study found that 66.7% of community and 66.8% of reporters believe that people in the community can be trusted to a great extent, 16.1% and 19.5% to neither a great nor small extent and 17.3% and 13.7% to

a small extent. In the community as in reporter groups females trust people less than males. 58.8% of females (54.8% female reporters) compared to 70.1% of males (70.7% of male reporters) trust people to a great extent and 25.5% of females (19.4% of female reporters) compared to 13.7% of males (11.8% of male reporters) to a small extent. Regarding trust across categories of people community members may encounter – the levels of trust expressed are usually high and for the most part have parity with that of the reporters. This includes trust of reporters where 75.8% of community members and 80.4% of reporters trust reporters. Where variances of approximately 10% or over occur are as follows: young adults and teenage children (68.1% of community trust them compared to 85.5% of reporters); government employees, security ministries and the police and military (69.8% of community trust them compared to 78.0% of reporters), and strangers (16.0% of community trust them compared to 25.0% of reporters). What this indicates is that there is broad agreement on levels of trust but reporters who historically are likely to have had more exposure to strangers, the military and 18-30 year olds are more trusting of all these than the community.

A majority of 63.3% of community members believe trust has increased in their area in the last year, and 28.9% that it has stayed the same compared to 43.6% and 48.6% of reporters respectively. A further 7.8% of community members and 7.7% of reporters state it has gotten worse. Less females than males perceive an improvement. The study found that 55.4% of females (31.7% of female reporters) and 66.9% of males (47.7% of male reporters) and marginally more females than males perceive a worsening: 10.7% (9.39% female reporters) compared to 6.5% (7.0% of male reporters). 5.4% of community members over 40 years of age, 2.6% aged 18-30 years and 12.0% aged 18-30 years perceive a worsening (8.7%, 7.3% and 6.2% of reporters over the same demographic categories).

There is no significant divergence of the views of community and the views of reporters as to why trust has improved: 26.1% (32.1% of reporters) believe it is because people collaborate and work better than before; 20.7% (15.5% of reporters) because of safety, security and peace; 18.9% (11.9% of reporters) because of regular meetings, good intra-community communications and agreed platforms for sharing problems, and a further 18.0% (30.4% reporter) because of togetherness, increased friendliness and trust. Within demographics there is broad similarity between female and male community members on why trust has improved except regarding the following two reasons: (i) regular meetings and interactions, good communications, platform for sharing problems, and (ii) security. In total 3.4% of females (10.0% female reporters) compared to 24.4% of males (12.3% of male reporters) believe regular meetings, communications and platforms are the reason and 37.9% of females (13.3% of female reporters), and 14.6% of males (15.9% of female reporters) believe safety and security concerns are the reason. This accurately reflects how females in the community have less participation in formal gatherings than males and how they are more isolated, more at risk in terms of personal security and so more conscious of safety and security issues than males. It also illustrates how in the contrast to female community members female reporters are more involved in formal forums, are likely to be more secure socially and economically. It should be noted that a similar pattern around peace and security emerges for 18-30 year olds: 37.95% of 18-30 year olds in the community compared with 18.7% of reporters in the same category identify peace and security as affecting levels of trust over the last two years.

4.3 Social cohesion and inclusion

Community and reporters have similar levels of perceived inclusion in the community: 96.7% of community members feel part of the community compared to 94.5% of reporters. 3.3% of community and 5.5% of reporters feel like outsiders. Of those who feel like outsiders, female community members and over 40 year olds are the highest response rates: 7.0% and 5.5% respectively compared to 5.9% and 2.7% in reporter groups (the sub-category in reporter groups that most feels it is an outsider is 18-30 year olds, 7.9% of which identify thus). 88.5% of community and 54.0% feel close to the other people in their

area and 9.9% and 11.5% respectively neither distant nor close. Similar to reporters in the community more males than females feel close (92.0% compared to 80.7%). Those who feel distant are largely female and younger community members 3.5% and 3.6% respectively compared to 7.8% and 9.0% in reporter groups.

The study found that 77.2% of female community members; 65.3% of male community members, 78.3% of 18 -30 year old, 67.5% of 31-40 year old, and 58.9% of over 40 year old community members agree that differences cause problems in their communities. This compares to 55.4% of reporters composed of 57.6% of female reporters; 54.7% of male reporters and 73.3% of reporters aged 18-30 years; 48.5% of reporters aged 31-40 years; 48.5% of reporters aged over 40 years and 60.3% of disabled reporters. However, as discussed above it is likely that the kinds of disputes being discussed are normal civil disputes not caused by reporters.

4.4 Empowerment

In order to measure empowerment across community and reporter respondents the survey examines the feelings or belief of respondents about their current emotional or psychological state, namely: (i) the extent to which respondents feel generally happy; (ii) whether they believe they have power to make important decisions; (iii) the degree to which they have control over decisions affecting everyday life, and (iv) the extent to which they feel valued. The survey also examined the degree to which respondents engaged in collective political activity and their perceptions on leadership. To analyze the first five points the report bases the analysis on mean scoring first and then on percentage responses in order to gain a more accurate understanding.

As noted above, based on mean score throughout the responses to questions around happiness and empowerment there is no relevant divergence between community and reporter. Both community members and reporters generally believe themselves to be happy and to neither a large nor small extent have power to make important decisions affecting their life. Similarly both community and reporter generally believe that they to neither a large nor small extent have power over decisions affecting everyday activities. However, overall community and reporter *do believe they have the ability* to make important decisions regarding their lives.

Of those who identify that they have either little or no control over decisions affecting their everyday life female community members are the most disempowered: 5.3% identify they have no control and 17.5% that they have control over very few decisions. This compares similarly to female reporters (5.9% and 16.7% respectively). The same groups have similar responses when identifying the degree to which they have the ability to make important decisions that can change the course of their life. The following proportion identify that they are unable to change their life: female community (15.8%); community 18-30 year olds (10.7%); female reporters (16.7%) and reporters aged 18-30 years old (10.3%). Community members aged 31-40 have the lowest negative response with only 2.5% identifying that they are unable compared to 8.0% of reporters in the same age category. These sets of responses confirm the profiles of all five groups: female community members and female reporters are more disempowered than males in each group. Younger community members and younger reporters are also similarly disempowered and the most established economic and socially networked sub-group of the community respondents (those aged 31-40 years) is the least disempowered when making decisions that impact on the course of their lives. Despite this most community members (and reporters) believe they personally have a positive impact on their communities (81.3% and 82.1% respectively). 68.5% of community members believe they are highly valued, 29.8% medium valued and only 1.7% lowly valued compared to 59.0%, 35.6% and 5.4% of reporters respectively. Female and male community members have comparable responses but in comparison to female reporters, female community members feel more highly valued than medium

valued: 70.2% of female reporters say they are highly valued and 26.3% that they are medium valued compared to 48.0% and 44.1% of female reporters respectively.

Most community member and reporters in all demographics are generally happy with slightly less females than male identifying so: 77.2% female community (66.0% female reporter) and 82.4% male community (72.5% male reporters). Comparatively most unhappy are female community members and female reporters at 15.8% and 17.5% respectively.

Regarding collective political action, respondents were asked in the past year how often they you joined other people to express concerns to GoU officials or local leaders on issues benefiting the community? 34.1% of the community have never joined to do so compared to 49.1% of reporters. 15.9% have done so once (17.9% of reporters); 30.2% five or less (22.1% of reporters); 19.8% more than five times (10.3% of reporters). Compared by demographics female community members are far less openly politically empowered than males: 50.9% have never joined together so and 26.4% of males have never joined together so, compared to 63.1% of reporter females and 45.1% of reporter males.

AS noted above across demographics there is approximately similarity between the percentage of reporters and communities who have never engaged in political action when those who have engaged are analyzed it is evident that active community members are twice as likely to be active multiple times, particularly 5 or less time sand more than five times.

4.5 Social change

Community members and reporters have similar levels of hope that their situation will improve in the medium term (79.3% and 71.7% respectively) with 5.0% and 4.9% identifying that they believe their situation will deteriorate. Female community members and those over 40 years are the most likely to identify this negative outcome (7.4% and 13.2% respectively) compared to female reporter and reporters aged 31-40 years (8.1% and 6.6% respectively). Satisfaction with life to date is similar between community members and reporters with 43.3% and 24.4% of community members saying they are satisfied and neither satisfied or dissatisfied respectively. This compares to 33.2% and 30.7% of reporters. There is a similar pattern across age groups but most notable the community members in the 31-40 year old category have the least dissatisfaction (20.0%) compared to all others who average 36.45% and the same category of reporters who rate 33.0%.

As has been seen above respondents were questioned using a 10 step ladder response prompt. Their responses are tabulated (table B14) and by mean score. The lower the mean score equals the responses state the respondent is closer to the bottom rung of the ladder, that is, where the poorest people tend to be. The higher the mean score equals the responses that the respondent is closer to the highest rung on the ladder, where the wealthy are. Community members like reporters tend to rate themselves somewhere in the middle of the bottom half of the ladder in response to all questions regarding current and past status in food poverty; housing; clothing and finances. However the community is nearly always one rung above the reporter groups reflecting the more positive self-perception but also the fact that as a group the community tends to be slightly more food secure, slightly better housed, slightly better in terms of clothing and slightly better in finances but not to a large extent .

Table 15. 9-step development ladder self-ratings (combined)

Consider a 9-step ladder where on the bottom, the first step, stand the poorest people, and on the ninth step, stand the richest -			On which step are you today in relation to food?	which step were you one year ago in relation to food?	which step are you today in relation to housing?	which step were you one year ago in relation to housing?	which step are you today in relation to clothing?	On which step were you one year ago in relation to clothing?	On which step are you today in relation to finances?	On which step were you one year ago in relation to finances?
18-30 years	Reporter	Mean	2.50	2.38	2.47	2.25	2.67	2.33	2.04	1.89
		N	157	155	156	154	157	155	157	154
	Community	Mean	3.63	3.04	3.37	2.86	3.73	3.08	3.06	2.47
		N	83	84	84	83	84	84	83	83
31-40 years	Reporter	Mean	3.02	2.65	2.63	2.22	2.95	2.64	2.42	2.18
		N	100	100	100	100	99	100	100	100
	Community	Mean	3.65	3.03	3.35	2.90	3.63	2.95	3.00	2.53
		N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Over 40years	Reporter	Mean	2.82	2.81	2.39	2.36	2.72	2.52	2.07	2.15
		N	150	150	150	150	150	149	149	150
	Community	Mean	2.75	2.79	2.79	2.59	3.00	2.88	2.39	2.40
		N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	55
Male	Reporter	Mean	2.85	2.64	2.63	2.34	2.80	2.55	2.17	2.08
		N	306	304	305	303	305	303	305	303
	Community	Mean	3.34	2.87	3.05	2.68	3.44	2.92	2.78	2.29
		N	124	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
Female	Reporter	Mean	2.43	2.48	2.03	2.13	2.63	2.23	2.06	1.99
		N	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104
	Community	Mean	3.35	3.09	3.42	2.96	3.58	3.16	2.98	2.85
		N	57	57	57	56	57	57	56	55
Total	Reporter	Mean	2.75	2.60	2.48	2.28	2.75	2.47	2.14	2.06
		N	410	408	409	407	409	407	409	407
	Community	Mean	3.34	2.94	3.16	2.77	3.48	2.99	2.84	2.46
		N	181	182	182	181	182	182	181	180
		Minimum	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1	Step 1
		Maximum	Step 8	Step 8	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9	Step 9

4.6 Summary

The community generally perceives itself as one rung above where it was two years ago and across genders there is broad agreement on the ratings. Young community members like young reporters perceive the most worsening situation but still rate themselves above the rating reporters give themselves. This largely confirms the trend throughout social capital (which subsequently consolidates that in the economic analysis in the previous section) that community and reporters have similar levels of social

capital including cohesion and empowerment but that reporters are marginally more vulnerable and have marginally less social capital in some areas than their community members. However, regarding important indicators of solidarity and cohesion both community and reporters correspond and have accurate and shared perceptions of the community and their place within it. Of all sub-categories in the community those aged 31-40 have the most significant social capital and in many areas the most positive outlook. This corresponds with the economic position and economic strength of this group in the community, something which is not shared with the comparative sub-category of the reporter groups.

What the overall comparison between these two demographic categories, one in the community and one in reporter groups is that those in the community have had the opportunity to maintain their economic activities, including gaining credit and develop the usual social networks including the key ones of family and friends. The category in the reporter group is indicative of reporters who through being absent with armed groups missed opportunities to develop economic and social networks and so to create basic but essential strengths such as credit worthiness. So the reporter category is lagging behind the most productive category in the community but this developmental lag is indicative of the reporter group as a whole. Within the community the most socially marginalized and apparently most disempowered are females and younger members of the community. This is comparatively within the community sample however for female community members in comparison to female reporters they have a less social capital than the reporter females. This corresponds with the evidence where female community members are weaker economically, educationally and vocationally than female reporters and also emphasizes that while female reporters are less secure and have challenges around stunted social networks female community members are more fearful, more suspicious of unknown people and are stymied by less engagement in formal social networks.

5. Reintegration Experiences

Following is an analysis of direct community experiences of reinsertion and reintegration of reporters. Within these is an analysis of how community perspectives have changed since the reintegration process began. For greatest analytical value this chapter should be read in conjunction with chapter 13.

5.1 Community sensitization and preparedness

The largest group in the community heard about the formal reinsertion of reporters into their community through the radio (34.8%), followed by word of mouth (25.9%); community meeting (17.1%) and 9.5% heard through other channels.²⁰ 12.7% of community members identify that they were not informed. Radio as the primary channel reached females more than males (48.7% compared to 36.4%) and more community members aged 18-30 years (57.4%) than 31-40 years (32.3%) and over 40 years (22.7%). Community meeting reached 12.8% of females, 22.2% of males and more older community members (31.8%) than 18-30 year olds (9.8%) and 31-40 year olds (22.6%). However most community members would prefer to be reached via a community meeting (51.4%) than any other channel. It is preferred by 51.9% of females and 52.4% of males as well as 43.4% of 18-30 year olds; 65.4% of 31-40 year olds and 51.5% of over 40 year olds. Radio which is the next highest response regarding preferred method of communication (25.2%) is preferred by 37.5% of 18-30 year olds, 15.4% of 31-40 year olds and 18.2% of over 40 year olds. 47.2% of community members state they were given no help in understanding how reintegration was going to take place in their community, 34.8% some help and 18.0% a lot of help. Female community members were less assisted than males (51.8% to 45.1%) and those aged 31-40 years were the least assisted age category: 59.5% compared to 44.6% of 18-30 year olds and 44.6% of over 40 year olds. An even higher portion of the community believes they should have been better informed and better assisted so they could help and better affect reporter reintegration 62.9% including 57.1% of females, 64.6% of males, 65.1% of 18-30 year olds, 67.5% of 31-40 year olds and 55.6% of over 40 year olds.

5.2 Historic community perspectives on reporter reintegration and fear

At the present time 63.7% of community members including 73.7% of females, 59.2% of males, 70.2% of 18-30 year olds, 57.5% of 31-40 year olds and 57.1% of over 40 year olds have a lot of direct contact with reporters. 21.4% has a little direct contact; 1.6% has some direct contact and 13.2% have no direct contact. When reporters first came to the community for reinsertion 56.4% of community members had fears relating to reporters and 43.6% did not. Female and males had a similar proportion who feared reporters (57.1% female, 56.0% male) and older community members were least fearful (44.6%) compared to 61.4% of 18-30 year olds and 62.5% of 31-40 year olds. Overwhelmingly fears were of male reporters (85.0%) rather than female reporters (31.9%); under 18 year olds (26.9%) and disabled reporters (21.1%). While the response rate is low, community members generally feared reporters because of the perceived threat of violent activity not related to conflict or war and crime. Today, only 3.3% of the community have fears about reporters. 43.4% identified that they have never had fears and 53.3% indicate that they had fears when reporters arrived but they do not hold them now. Those who have fears are predominantly females (8.8% of female community members) and 18-30 years olds (4.8%).

On reflection 21.8% of community members believe the community should have behaved differently when reporters were reinserted and 78.2% that it should not have behaved differently. Female and male community members correspond in this response. Of those who believed the community should have

²⁰ Respondents identified, rumour, LDVs, police, observation and the AC.

behaved differently 17.9% believed the community should have provided more general support to male reporters, 22.2% to female reporters, 20% to reporter children and 20.0% to disabled reporters. 25.0% believe the community could have better shown respect, forgiveness and welcome to male reporters, 14.8% to female reporters, 15.0% to reporter children and 25.0% to disabled reporters. 14.3% believe the community could have better avoided isolating male reporters, blaming them and creating stigma and 29.6% believe the same of female reporters, 25.0% of child reporters and 20.0% of disabled reporters.

5.3 Positive and negative reporter behavior

When reflecting on the behavior of reporters who returned, 27.9% of the community believe that reporters should have behaved differently. Of those who believe reporters should have behaved differently 72.3% believe male reporters in particular should have done so, 37.5% that female reporters should have done so; 37.5% that child reporters should have done so and 21.9% that disabled reporters should have done so. 8.7% believe that male reporters should have been better at avoiding interpersonal conflict, 15.2% that they should have better improved their outlook on life; 15.2% that they should have better shown respect; 10.9% that they were unruly and substance mis-using. 16.7% believe female reporters should have shown more respect and 16.7% that they should have improved their outlook. 4.2% believe female reporters should have better avoided interpersonal conflict. 16.7% believe child reporters should have improved their outlook on life and 8.3% believe each of the following three: shown more respect; refrained from substance mis-use, and avoided interpersonal conflict.

6. Conclusions

As has been discussed through the study it has been found that that reporters and community members in Uganda largely are successfully reintegrated. It has also discussed how it is not possible to isolate one driver of integration in Uganda however the role communities have played in accepting back reporters into families, social networks and the community in general while not complete or without problems has positively facilitated reporter reintegration. Communities have also shown solid understanding of the reintegration challenges facing reporters as they work to gain economic parity with the fellow community members. This is despite what appears to have been only moderate preparation of the community for return of reporters.

6.1 The community and economic reintegration

This study has found that in Uganda, despite chronic development challenges communities are welcoming, accepting of reporters and understand that reporters face added challenges to catch up with the community in terms of economic productivity, meeting household expenses and accessing credit. Reporters, because of their lack of skills, access to land, and because of their uncertain history can be perceived as a liability and can provoke a reaction of fear and hostility. However the study has found that this is not the case. Rather the study has found that the return of reporters is characterized by understanding by the community and a sense of acceptance.

Community members are familiar with reporters: just under two thirds of the community sample have reporters in their immediate family, particularly 18-30 year olds community members. This should inform any understanding of levels of acceptance. The study has found that when reporters began to be reinserted in the communities just over half of the communities had fears relating to the return. Overwhelming fears held by the community were fears pertaining to male reporters although around a third of the community had fears for female and 18-30 year olds reporters. It would appear from the response rates that for many the fear was a general apprehension of return of reporters. Those who could identify exactly what the fear was mentioned a fear of social unrest or violent social activity. Today however only 3.3% of the community have any fears about reporters showing how complete the dispelling of the risk of reporter return has been to the community.

The community accurately understands the barriers experienced by reporters as they attempt to achieve economic productivity on a par with fellow community members. Lack of qualifications for work is the most frequently cited barrier to *employment* by a similar percentage of reporters and community members. Two other barriers to employment are: lack of education and stigma. Lack of employment specific training is the main barrier identified by both groups that must be navigated by reporters. Regarding barriers to *economic productivity* both the community and reporters identify that in the main they both experience the same barriers

There are subtle differences between the two groups with the community's lesser concern about capital which indicates to the difference between the two groups when accessing credit. The community has more established economic practices (and track records) compared to reporters. This is a symptom of reporters recovering from the time lost that they spent in armed rebellion). However just under one third of reporters identify lack of financial support or capital as threat compared to roughly have that proportion of the community. Also the community is more worried about inflation than reporters, which also supports the idea that reporters are at an earlier economic stage and so more affected by issues more common less established economic activities.

Opinions of and perceptions by the community and reporters largely correspond which is a high level indicator of economic reintegration, at least *perceptually*. Measures of the *actual* economic profile of reporters and community and comparative analysis of key indicators of economic productivity such as access to credit and household income thresholds add an additional depth to the analysis. Dynamics such as positions held in economic associations add nuance to the analysis indicating stages of reintegration that are also commensurate with the degree to which reporters believe they can be open about their past and participate politically.

6.2 The community and social reintegration

At the heart of social reintegration are functioning social networks. In the study, the composition, sustainability and functionality of the social networks of reporters and communities was assessed in order to accurately gauge how well these basic pathways to social reintegration and support were working for each group. The degree to which one has diverse and strong social and economic networks has a direct bearing on mental health and wellbeing of reporters as well as opportunities for further economic progress. At the core of most social networks is the family, the primary unit.

The study has found that reporters and communities are very well socially integrated together and have broadly similar understandings of the dynamics of their communities. Communities value reporters and reporters generally feel valued in their community. The community and reporters share perceptions concerning trust and security in the community and reporters are not seen as a threat to either. Consequently the community contributes to enabling reporters to be secure enough to be open about their past. The community and reporters share the same perception of the high levels of diversity in their communities and while they both recognize that diversity and difference can contribute to conflict, the conflict identified does not appear to have anything to do with the wars of the past or with anyone being a reporter. To the same extent the majority of community members and reporters feel welcome and part of the wider community.

However there are still barriers in the community. While there are no perceptual barriers to inter-marriage between the community and reporters the fact remains that there is limited actual marriage. Community members are more likely to engage in open political protest and to collectively represent their opinions in public. However, we know from observation and field work that in some communities reporters are prominent leaders in a variety of positions in society so it would appear that while some more recent returnees are cautious about expressing themselves, for male reporters anyway there is little evidence that the community has a collective tendency to exclude reporters from leadership positions. Rather it could be that with time the situation will improve, much as perceptions of peace, security and personal safety tend to improve the longer reporter is home.

6.3 Female community sub-group

Throughout the study female reporters and female community members are consistently the more disadvantaged gender. The study finds that in comparison to male community members and across most demographic, social and economic indicators female community members seriously underperform and are more at risk of isolation and social exclusion. When comparing female community members to female reporters, female reporters often outperform female community members in some key development areas (i) land ownership; (ii) vocational training and training; (iii) household finances including breaking-even at the end of each month and (iv) social networks but in others experience the shared traits of the reporter group which is often to be a degree less secure or sustainable than the community group.

Female reporters are far more skilled than female community members. This is reflected in how female community members consider education or lack of skills as their main barrier to education where as half as many female reporter population identifying that as barriers. Female reporters are more concerned by health and access to credit. Regarding personal credit and savings nearly all female community members compared to just over half of female reporters belong to savings associations.

As is seen throughout the study female community members are more likely to be the functional household head than female reporters with responsibility for feeding the households and so they engage in credit and savings as essential strategies to ensure that family needs are met. However this indicates the degree to which female community members are combining frequent borrowing and saving to maintain the lowest level of food and income security in the sample. In household finances female community members are far less likely to break even than female reporters and where a small proportion of female reporters have money left at the end of the month no female community members do. This builds a picture of female community members relative disadvantage to male community members and their financial disadvantage to female community members which elaborates somewhat on how female reporters are better skilled and educated than female community members.

Females in the community have less participation in formal gatherings than males and how they are more isolated, more at risk in terms of personal security and so more conscious of safety and security issues than males. Female community members and female reporters where female reporters are more involved in formal forums or associations. Despite having similar social network challenges to female community members, female reporter are likely to be more secure socially, economically and in how they perceive the security of the external environment. To this extent the study finds that future development programs targeting the reintegration of female reporters should include a more appropriate cohort of female civilians to promote social and economic inclusion of this group. This is particularly relevant for CDD and micro-finance projects that may enable female community members to collaborate and better function economically.

www.tdrp.net