

Poverty, Shame and Social Exclusion

Work Package 5

The Shame of it: Uganda's' Anti-Poverty Policies

Grace Bantebya Kyomuhendo

Amon Mwiine

2012

Professor Grace Bantebya Kyomuhendo, Department of Women and Gender Studies,
Makerere University, Uganda <gbantebya@yahoo.com>

Amon Mwiine, Department of Women and Gender Studies, Makerere University,
Uganda. <amonmwiine@gmail.com>



Research jointly supported by the ESRC and DFID

The Shame of it: Uganda's' Anti-Poverty Policies

Uganda Country Context

According to the 2002 Population and Housing Census, Uganda's population was 24.4 million, with a sex ratio of 95 males per 100 females (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2004). The majority of the population, 88 percent, lived in rural settings, with only 12 percent urban dwellers (ibid). With a per capital GDP of US\$ 1,457 in the year 2003 (UNDP 2005) Uganda was and is still considered among the poorest countries in the world.

Agriculture is the mainstay of the economy, contributing 31% of GDP, 85% of exports and employing at least 77% of the active labour force (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2007; European Union 2003; MFPED 2004).

The reduction of poverty and vulnerability has been an integral part of Uganda's national development strategy and significant success has been attained over the past decade.

The percentage of Ugandans living in poverty decreased from 56.4 to 24.5 percent between 1992/3 and 2009/10. This success means that there were over 23 million Ugandans living above the poverty line¹ in 2010. However of this group around 13 million are classified as insecure non poor. These households had consumption below twice the poverty line, were able to meet

¹ A measure of absolute poverty is the minimum consumption below which individuals are considered poor. It reflects the cost of consuming 3000 calories per day based on the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population.

their basic needs, but remained insecure and vulnerable to falling into absolute poverty. The figure below reflects Ugandans' current poverty status.

Poverty status at a glance

Number and percent of Ugandans that are absolutely poor, insecure non-poor and middle class.

Year	1992/93	1999/00	2002/03	2005/06	2009/10
Absolutely poor (millions)	9.9	7.4	9.3	8.5	7.5
Percent below the poverty line.	56.4%	33.8%	38.8%	31.1%	24.5%
Non poor but insecure (millions)	5.8	9.6	9.6	11.0	13.2
Percent non-poor but insecure	33.4%	43.9%	39.9%	40.2%	42.9%
Middle class (millions)	1.8	4.9	5.1	7.8	10.0
Percent in the middle class	10.2%	22.4%	21.2%	28.7%	32.6%

Source: UNHS various years

Inequality based on Gini coefficient

Year	1992/93	2002/03	2005/06	2009/10
Uganda	0.365	0.428	0.408	0.426
Rural	0.328	0.363	0.363	0.375
Urban	0.396	0.483	0.432	0.447

Source: UNHS Various years and IHS 1992/3. Zero expresses perfect equality and one expresses maximal inequality.

Selected Millennium Development Goals

	2001	2004	2007	2012
Net enrolment ratio in primary education	87%	90%	93%	96%

Completion rate to primary 7.	63%	62%	47%	54%
	1995	2000/01	2005/06	2011*
Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)	156	152	137	90
Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)	81	88	76	54
Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 births)	506	505	435	352
Proportion of births attended to by skilled personnel	38%	39%	42%	59%
Contraceptive prevalence rate	15%	23%	24%	30%

Sources: Education & Sports Sector Annual Performance Report 2007/08;
UDHS various years;

Uganda MDG Report 2010; *UDHS2011 Draft Report; \$indicative estimate-
Institute of Health Metrics.

Other welfare indicators.

	2005/06	2009/10
Children under 18 years with possession of a blanket	35.3%	43.1%
Households with iron roofed houses	60.6%	61.8%
Households with at least one mobile phone	16.7%	46.3%
Proportion of population using mosquito nets	16.8%	41.1%

Source: UNHS various years

The 10 million Ugandans above twice the poverty line-classified as the middle class-are distinct in a number of respects. They are much less vulnerable. They face lower risks because their incomes are higher and more stable, and they are better able to cope with risk because they have more assets and better access to savings instruments and insurance mechanisms. This middle class devotes a higher proportion of total consumption to expenditure on education, and has fewer and more-educated children. Middle class households are marginally more likely to run a business but much more likely to benefit from a non-agricultural wage income and much less likely to rely on subsistence agriculture. In contrast, the distinctions between the poor and those just above the poverty line are less pronounced.

There has been progress across all the regions of the country. Between 2005/6 and 2009/10 the largest improvements in welfare were experienced in the central and eastern regions and West Nile. But there remains very large variation across the country. In Kampala, 77 percent of the population is middle class. In the North East, 76 percent are poor. (Poverty Status Report, 2012)

The findings of a Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) survey confirm that there has been significant progress. In 1990, lack of a hand hoe or of an animal hide were perceived as key indicators of poverty. The same communities in 2011 reported the lack of an ox plough or mattress as the corresponding characteristics of poverty. Likewise, those perceived to be poor in 1990 lacked access to education and health care, but today the quality of these services is the key issue. Of the 1,344 households in the sampled PPA villages, 22 percent were perceived to be extremely poor. This roughly corresponds to the 24.5 percent of Ugandans living below the national poverty line, which should be interpreted as a measure of absolute poverty reflecting the increasing importance of relative poverty (Uganda Poverty Status Report 2012)

Overview of the anti-poverty policy context.

Poverty reduction has been and continues to be the focus of the Uganda government's development strategy. A number of antipoverty programmes/policies have been implemented over the past two decades, but the key ones include;

Decentralization

Since 1986, the Central Government has been strongly committed to implementing a grassroots approach to governance, beginning with devolution and later administrative and fiscal decentralization. The 1995 Constitution and

the Local Government Act 1997 empowered Local Governments as the entities responsible to deliver essential services to the population at the sub-national level. Local governments remain at the forefront of public interventions to reduce poverty.

The PEAP

The beginning of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) era in 1997 saw the government shift focus from rehabilitation to poverty eradication. The PEAPs were designed to guide the prioritization of public policy cooperation between the Government and its development partners, particularly in the provision of social services such as education, health and sanitation.

Poverty Action Fund

The PAF was set up in 1998/1999 in order to channel resources from HIPC debt relief to key sectors identified in the PEAP. The virtual fund became an integral part of the national budget, instrumental in translating the PEAP priorities into public expenditure.

Universal Primary Education

Universal Primary Education (UPE) was the flagship intervention under the first PEAP introduced in 1997. The policy entailed free primary school tuition to four children per household, although parents retained the responsibility for providing exercise books, pens, uniforms and school meals. The result was a near doubling in primary school pupils enrolment from 2.9 million in 1996 to 5.3 million in 1997. UPE also decentralized school management, giving local governments the responsibility to recruit teachers, construct classrooms and inspect schools.

Plan for Modernization of Agriculture

The Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) was initiated in 2001 as a key component of the PEAP. It remains a cross-sectoral framework to guide policies and investment plans seeking to enable the rural poor to improve their livelihoods sustainably, particularly by raising farm productivity, increasing the share of agricultural production that is marketed, and creating on-farm and off-farm employment.

National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)

A key component of PMA, NAADS was put in place in 2001 to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of agricultural extension services. The NAADS Act 2001 formed a semi-autonomous body with a mandate to develop a demand-driven agricultural service delivery system for poor subsistence farmers. NAADS employs an innovative public-private approach to empower farmers to demand and control agricultural advisory services. The programme was expected to have positive impact on the adoption of new crop and livestock enterprises, the use of modern agricultural production technologies and practices, and the commercial marketing of commodities.

Rural Electrification

A nationwide programme initiated in 2000, implemented by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development. The objective is to enhance incomes and the quality of rural life by extending access to the national electricity grid. In 2001, only around 80,000 rural consumers were registered on the grid. The target for universal access has been set for 2035.

Prosperity for All

In 2005 Government placed renewed emphasis on poverty alleviation under the prosperity for all programme (PFA). The pillars of PFA are production, value addition, marketing and microfinance.

The Rural Financial Services Strategy (RFSS)

One of the major pillars of PFA, the RFSS guides the delivery of financial services in rural areas. Emphasis is placed on savings, credit and investment to improve production and processing for value addition. There are now over 2,800 Savings and Credit Cooperative Organizations (SACCOs) throughout the country. Lending is channeled through the SACCO network to smallholder farmers through farmer groups at below-market interest rates.

Regional programmes

Government has long recognized that development challenges differ across different parts of the country, particularly those recovering from conflict and insecurity. To address this, a number of regionally specific programmes have been implemented. Examples include;

Northern Uganda Social Action Fund

NUSAF is a decentralized development project created in 2003 to empower communities to apply for government grants for infrastructure development and construction; to mobilize income support and acquisition of livestock for the ultra-poor; and to equip them with vocational training skills and tools. The ultimate objectives of the programme are to empower the communities of Northern Uganda to identify, prioritize and plan their needs; and to revive income-generating activities to improve the economic welfare of households.

Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Plan. (KIDDP)

Started in 2001, the KIDDP is overseen by the Office of the Prime Minister, operational within the districts of Moroto, Kotido and Nakapiripirit. Disarmament is pursued in conjunction with improved service delivery and efforts to encourage diversification of income-generating activities to reduce dependency on cattle rearing and ensure total peace and stability.

The National Development Plan (NDP)

Government's new policy framework, the National Development Plan (NDP), is a response to the economic success of the PEAP era. The gains made revealed a number of structural bottlenecks which began to undermine further development. The NDP maintains the vision of poverty eradication but with additional emphasis on economic transformation and wealth creation. It is envisaged that the sustained reduction and eventual eradication of poverty will only be possible with the structural transformation of the Ugandan economy; and the NDP thus prioritizes addressing the key binding constraints such as inadequate physical infrastructure.

Further the NDP recognizes the growing number of Ugandans who no longer live in absolute poverty but are still striving to better their lives and seeks to generate the economic opportunities that this group demands. Nevertheless the 24.5 percent of the population who remain in poverty have not been overlooked by the NDP. By ensuring equal access to these opportunities, the objectives of poverty reduction and national development can be pursued simultaneously.

Government anti poverty policies: an analysis

In this analysis, focus was on key government anti-poverty policies/programs, especially those encountered in the study. For each selected policy or program we examined how its framing, structuring and delivery creates or ameliorates poverty induced shame; and impacts on the agency of those living in poverty.

In respect to policy framing, focus was on the language used; whether it is inclusive or exclusive; supportive, threatening or abusive; and whether it targets individuals or categories of people.

The policy aims/goals or objectives were analyzed from various contexts including poverty relief/income support or investment; support to families/individuals; and whether they challenge or reinforce gender differences in accessing resources and benefits.

With regard to policy structure, analysis focused on issues such as whether allocation is influenced by financial need or citizenship; criteria for targeting area/community or family; unit of income/needs assessment (individual nuclear/extended family); gender; and structure of equivalence scale.

As for policy delivery, analysis dwelt on the nature of identification of beneficiaries, targeting or eligibility. The policies and/or programmes encountered in the research and selected for analysis include UPE, PMA/NAADS and PFA/RFSS. For the latter focus was on delivery/access to rural financial services through SACCOs.

Universal Primary Education (UPE): Framing of the Current Education Policy

The 1992 Government White Paper on Education is the basis of official policy on the purpose and programmes of education. While some of the programmes have been revised as a result of intervening events; the White Paper's

articulation of the purposes of Uganda’s education system continues to be the supreme guidance for the sector. Its aims are to promote citizenship; moral, ethical and spiritual values; to promote scientific, technical and cultural knowledge, skills and attitudes; to eradicate illiteracy and equip individuals with the basic skills and knowledge and with the ability to “contribute to the building of an integrated, self-sustaining and independent national economy”.

The key policy thrust in the educational sector for both rural and urban Uganda includes providing equitable access to quality and affordable education to all Ugandans; propelling the nation towards achieving the goals of Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), meeting commitments to achieve Education for all (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015; providing relevant education; and enhancing efficiency and strengthening partnership in the education sector. In Uganda, education is a constitutional right enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda; article 30 makes education for children a human right and article 34 entitles children to basic education by the state and parents.

The current education policy focuses on expanding the functional capacity of educational structures and reducing the inequalities of access to education between sexes, geographical areas, and social classes in Uganda. It advocates for the redistribution of resources vis-a-vis reforming the educational sector. More resources have been allocated to lower educational public sector through the UPE programme in order to enhance equity of access at that level between boys and girls (MoES 1998b). Higher education especially tertiary education is increasingly becoming liberalized, which in fact means privatized. The impact of this shift in policy on the female gender is yet to be ascertained, but for females from poor districts, their chances of higher education have become increasingly small.

In addition to the MDGs, Uganda is also committed to meeting the education for all (EFA) goals (set in Jomtien in 1990 and reaffirmed in Dakar in 2000). The current Government efforts in the education sector, especially the launching of the Universal Primary Education (UPE) policy are by and large, premised on the recommendations of the Government White Paper on Education of 1992, but also focus towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) goals (Education Sector Policy Overview Paper, 2006).

Equitable Access to Primary Education and Universal Primary Education

The government has pursued policies to expand access to all levels of the education system, with a special emphasis placed on primary education because it directly benefits the rural poor. The Universal Primary Education (UPE) was launched in 1997 following the recommendations of the Education Policy Review Commission (EPRC, 1989) and the subsequent relevant stipulations of the Government of Uganda White Paper and the Children's Statute (1996).

The Government set the key objectives of UPE as:

- (a) making basic education accessible to the learners and relevant to their needs as well as meeting national goals;
- (b) making education equitable in order to eliminate any disparities and inequalities.
- (c) establishing, providing and maintaining quality education as the basis for promoting the necessary human resource development.
- (d) initiating a fundamental positive transformation of society in the social, economic and political fields; and

(e) ensuring that education is affordable by the majority of Ugandans by providing initially, the minimum necessary facilities and resources, and progressively the optimal facilities, to enable every child to enter and remain in school until they complete the primary school education cycle.

Overall the policy emphasizes equal opportunity for both boys and girls; promoting parity in enrollment, retention, and performance in primary education.

Structuring UPE Policy

In order to attain the set UPE objectives, government from the onset in 1997 committed itself to provide the following.

- tuition fees for four children per family at the rate of (U) Shs. 5,000/= per pupil per annum for classes P1-P3 and Shs. 8,100/= per pupil per annum for classes P4 to P7.
- instructional materials in the form of text books.
- construction of basic physical facilities in the form of classrooms, laboratories, libraries and teachers' houses by providing iron sheets, cement, timber, and nails while local authorities and communities would make additional input especially in the form of labour for construction.
- pay teacher's salaries.
- train teachers.

Other costs of schooling including transport, uniforms among others remained the responsibility of families.

Though only four children per family, with girls as a mandatory inclusion were initially targeted, this was soon scrapped, and sponsorship for tuition extended to all school age children in the families. Apparently the criteria for targeting shifted from financial need to citizenship, a move that some critics perceived as reflecting populism, with vested political connotations for the incumbent government.

Government committed itself to implementing the UPE programme in all government aided primary schools, both rural and urban. The responsibility for managing and supervising the schools was devolved from central government to district councils, later in 1997.

Delivery of the UPE Policy/Program

Though reforms in preparation for UPE started in 1993, including teacher and management development, curriculum and assessment reform, development of instructional materials and new arrangements for monitoring progress; enrollment did not grow substantially until 1996 when the first direct presidential election was held in Uganda.

The incumbent president campaigned on a UPE platform; and eleven years after gaining power, started the implementation of UPE in 1997. A nationwide enumeration exercise was undertaken and the government committed itself to providing tuition fees for four children per family, instructional materials, basic physical facilities, teachers' salaries and training. Gross primary enrollment rates (GERs) rose from 77 percent in 1996 to 137 percent in 1997 and net enrolment from 57 per cent to 85 percent. Enrollment in P1 increased threefold and females accounted for 47 percent of enrollment by 1999. Growth in the number of schools was not commensurate and the number of pupils per school doubled between 1980 and 1999. In 1997, the drop-out rate at the primary

level was reported at 6 percent and the repetition rate 11 percent (Avenstrup, Liang and Nellemann, 2004).

It is evident that the introduction of free primary education was influenced by the transition to democratic politics with political demand overriding rational planning. The policy was consequently implemented without time for detailed planning and in the absence of sufficient baseline data. Skepticism was prevalent and pointed to potential problems of finance, sustainability and educational quality. There was little time either to mobilize funding and make adequate budgetary preparations or to undertake the necessary structural and organizational reforms to develop capacity for massive expansion.

Avenstrup, Liang and Nelleman (2004) have described the results as “access shock”. The large increase in enrollment resulted in overcrowding, multiple shifts, teacher and material shortages and a rise in ‘overage’ students. For example, the GER rose from 68 to 123 percent in the first year of UPE and enrollment rose to 240 percent in six years. In spite of these shortcomings, access improved considerably and the effect on the poor was particularly marked. Access among the poorest quintile was almost as high as that of the richest quintile (Aventstrup, et al. 2004; Deininger, 2003).

The framing of UPE policy

The language used in the 1992 Government White Paper on education, and in the recommendations of the EPRC, that are the basis of framing the UPE policy may be described as moderate, all inclusive and supportive, targeting all categories of individuals including the poor, in society. There is no evidence deliberate or implicit, of shaming the targeted poor UPE beneficiaries.

It is mentioned however that special focus is placed on primary education because it directly benefits the rural poor. Although mention of the rural poor,

apparently as a priority target is at most only casual, it has the effect of attaching a shaming, poverty label to the program. Evidence from WP2 research shows that it is this poverty labeling that the UPE beneficiaries-both pupils and parents, find shameful and detest.

However, the five objectives of the programme, though broad in nature, do not directly or indirectly make reference to poverty induced shame. Objective (b) in particular seeks to eliminate any disparities and inequalities by making access to education equitable. Objective (e) seeks to ensure that education is affordable by all. Achieving these two objectives per se would not only offer poverty relief but overall have the effect of ameliorating poverty induced shame among the targeted UPE beneficiaries.

Though it is not especially stated as an objective, it is implicitly clear from objective (b) that the UPE policy emphasizes equal opportunity for boys and girls in enrolment, a factor that challenges gender differentials in access to primary education that had hitherto bedeviled the pre UPE education system.

In a nutshell the framing of the UPE policy in spite of attaching a poverty label to the programme does not explicitly promote poverty shame. Rather the emphasis placed on eliminating any disparities and inequalities in access, and achieving gender parity in enrollment may be broadly seen in the light of mitigating poverty shame and enhancing the agency of those living in poverty.

Structuring of UPE policy and poverty shaming.

It is rational to strongly argue that it is the structuring of the UPE policy that is implicitly the genesis of poverty induced shaming of pupils from poor households that was much evident in WP2 research. The indiscriminate targeting of all pupils in government aided primary schools meant the pooling together of children from both the deserving and non deserving families. The

assumption or premise that poverty is universal and hence all families deserve was fundamentally flawed since even before the advent of UPE many families could comfortably afford to pay for their children's education both in government aided and private schools.

In the rural areas such as our study sites, private schools were few and most children irrespective of socio-economic status were enrolled in the well established government aided primary schools. Thus when UPE was introduced and became mandatory in all government aided schools, the relatively rich families who could comfortably afford tuition and other fees for their children had no option but to keep their children enrolled in the now lowly ranked UPE schools. In urban areas where private schools were well established, the well to do parents moved fast to avoid UPE and enrolled their children in private schools which though relatively expensive provided better quality education.

In the free rural government aided schools meanwhile due to the “access shock” academic and other standards continued not only to plummet but differences between children from the poor and relatively rich families started to emerge. Whereas the children from the latter, undeserving families benefited by accessing free tuition and were well catered for by their parents by way of school requirements including uniform, stationery, lunch and pocket money among others, this was not the case for pupils from the genuinely “deserving” impoverished families. Despite accessing free tuition from government they often had to do without school essentials like uniform, lunch, scholastic materials especially exercise books and pens among others. Under UPE structuring, provision of the latter was and still is a responsibility of the pupils' families.

For the pupils from poor families, the stark differences between them and their better off peers quite naturally triggered off negative, internalized feelings of shame, inadequacy, low self worth and anger among others. For these genuinely deserving beneficiaries of UPE, the government aided primary schools, the free education they provided notwithstanding, degenerated into unavoidable arenas of poverty induced shaming.

Further, the nature of UPE financing, especially the scrapping of school fees, had adverse effects not only on the schools generally but pupils from poor households as well. For the rural government aided schools in particular, the scrapping of school fees before infrastructural improvements in the school system, coupled with the “access shock” had adverse effects such as a decrease of resources available per pupil, a large increase in the pupil- teacher ratio, and increased reliance on the unreliable and untimely remittance of funds from Ministry of Education headquarters in Kampala.

Though government devolved management of UPE schools to district councils later in 1997, the extent to which this improved the amount and efficiency of disbursement of funds to the rural government aided primary schools remains unclear. What is clear though is that the effects of inadequate and untimely funding were particularly adverse for children from poor households. Failure by government for instance on its commitment to provide text books and inability of pupils from poor households to afford text books unlike their richer peers, were major aspects of the school system that poor pupils described as sources of poverty induced shaming in WP2 research.

Government did not only negate or delay in implementation of most of its UPE structural commitments, but also informally instituted others that turned out to exacerbate shaming of pupils from poor households. The refusal of

government to allow school management to charge lunch fees to enable pupils to have lunch at school, for instance became a contentious issue. When some head teachers started charging lunch fees, the President’s response was prompt, explicit and threatening as quoted in the box below;

Box 1

President Yoweri Museveni yesterday addressed the Busoga Kingdom Lukiiko (assembly) warning that headmasters who flout his directive against charging lunch fees under the Universal Primary Education scheme would end up in jail.

At the start of his five-day tour of Busoga, Museveni advised rich parents, who insist that their children must have lunch at school, to take them to private schools instead of forcing poor parents to pay for meals.

Museveni said he was receiving persistent reports that pupils are forced out of school because their parents cannot afford lunch fees. Nobody is allowed to charge what he called “mandatory charges” in UPE schools.

The Government introduced UPE to ensure that all children get education, he said. Under UPE, parents and the Government have different roles. The parents provide entanda (meals), exercise books, uniform, and pens and ensure hygienic conditions, he added. The Government pays teachers’ salaries, provides textbooks, libraries and laboratories.

He advised leaders to concentrate on problems that affect the UPE program, like addressing the performance of teachers.

Another purpose of his visit was to inform the population that the NRM believed in educating the masses, hence the introduction of UPE and

Universal Secondary Education programmes.

Source Esther Mukyala, the New Vision (date).

Many children from poor households interviewed in WP2 research described going without lunch as not only physically disorienting, but shaming as well especially when they compared themselves with their better off peers who carried appetizing packed lunches to school.

The automatic promotion of pupils from one class to another irrespective of academic performance, that was later smuggled by government into UPE structuring, did not also augur well for the image of the government aided UPE schools. The academic standards in the UPE schools were not only further eroded, but the schools per se were seen in the communities as institutions for promoting illiteracy or academic mediocrity. For the pupils from poor households who had no alternative enrollment options, the UPE (Bonabasome)² schools, became unavoidable arenas of poverty induced shaming.

Delivery of UPE policy and poverty shaming

As previously noted, the UPE policy/programme was due to political pressure implemented in a hasty, headlong fashion without adequate budgetary preparations, or structural and organizational reforms to develop capacity for massive nationwide enrollment of pupils in government aided primary schools. For the rural primary schools attended by most of the poor and vulnerable children, the results of the “access shock” that among others eroded the quality of education, were catastrophic for the poor children. The parents of the poor

² Bonabasome (education for all) soon degenerated to Bonabakone (illiteracy/mediocrity for all); a derogatory, undignifying phrase that both the poor pupils and their respective families described as particularly shaming

children had no option but to enroll their children in the UPE schools that had deteriorated to a level where they were considered shameful even by local rural standards. In WP2 research both the parents and pupils described their choice of the UPE schools attended as shameful options of last resort.

It is apparent that more than a decade of implementation of UPE has not resulted in significant improvement in education standards and infrastructural developments; and the shame and/or stigma attached to UPE schools has persisted. The result in both rural and urban areas has been the mushrooming of private schools.

In the rural areas however many of the relatively rich parents have continued to enroll their children in the lowly ranked UPE schools, to exploit shamelessly the free tuition benefit. Nevertheless these undeserving parents strive to ensure that their children avoid the shaming poverty label of attending such schools by providing them with all the necessary material requirements to ensure that they stand out. It is the stark disparities between these children and those coming from poor households that are the source of poverty induced shaming for the latter.

In a nutshell, it can be argued that the framing of the UPE policy had noble objectives, genuinely seeking to address the literacy needs of children from the poor and most vulnerable families. This however cannot be said about the structuring and implementation mechanisms of the policy. Whereas the latter do not have a language that explicitly creates poverty induced shame, at the same time they lack capacity to promote the agency of the poor and/or ameliorate poverty induced shaming in UPE schools.

A fundamental flaw in policy structuring was the universal targeting of beneficiaries that pooled together children from the genuinely deserving and

undeserving families. This has not only placed unnecessary constraints on resources from government, but has created conditions that cement poverty induced shaming in the schools.

PMA/NAADS

Framing Policy

Within the wider framework of the PEAP and the set of priorities related to agriculture and rural development identified therein, the plan for modernization of agriculture (PMA) was prepared in 2000 as a multi-sectoral strategy oriented to “eradicate poverty through a profitable, competitive, sustainable and dynamic agricultural and agro-industrial sector” (MAAIF, 2006). This vision is premised on the necessity of transforming poor subsistence farmers into progressive commercial entrepreneurs. The PMA has the following set objectives.

- increase incomes and improve the quality of life of poor subsistence farmers through increased productivity and increased share of marketed production;
- improve household food security through the market rather than emphasizing self sufficiency;
- provide gainful employment through the secondary benefits of PMA implementation such as agro-processing factories and services;

- promote sustainable use and management of natural resources by developing a land use and management policy and promotion of environmentally friendly technologies.

The PMA identifies the key areas in which specific policies for the agricultural sector should be developed and implemented. As far as research is concerned, the PMA specifically states that agricultural research will be farmer-oriented and farmer-driven and that private sector participation and funding need to be increased. Regarding agricultural advisory services, the PMA affirms that: “Government will formulate an extension policy that will promote an efficient extension service primarily based on private sector delivery. Given that in the foreseeable future, the provision of this kind of services to smallholder resource poor farmers will continue to be regarded as public good, Government will increase its overall annual spending on provision of extension services to poor farmers”

The PMA further goes on to state that if the agricultural research system is to benefit the poor and contribute to food security, it has to operate with the participation of farmers, have capacity to interpret the poor peoples’ needs, constraints and resources; and generate practical options to improve them. Complementarily PMA asserts that a National Agricultural Advisory Service, NAADS is to be put in place, where “the farmers are empowered as partners and have a role to play. The work programme and activities of these advisors will be determined by the farmers themselves”.

Informed by this conceptual framework, a government taskforce with the participation of bilateral partners, initiated the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) Programme as a programme of the Government of Uganda to increase the efficiency and quality of the agricultural extension services, through a decentralized demand-driven and private sector-oriented approach,

as a response to the poor performance and low stakeholder support of the existing Unified Extension Service (MAAIF. 2000a; World Bank, 2001b)

Objectives

The general objective of NAADS is to ensure that farmers apply improved husbandry and management practices, and identify and solve their technical and marketing problems using appropriate and modern knowledge and technologies.

The specific objectives are to:

- increase the availability of appropriate advice and information to all the farmer types in an equitable and cost-effective manner.
- avail appropriate technologies in sufficient quantities to meet identified farmer needs;
- assure the quality of advice and information provided to farmers by service providers.
- enhance the capacity of private sector service providers to meet farmer advice and information needs;
- develop appropriate farmer-controlled institutional structures and processes for managing NAADS at all levels

Principles

- to achieve the mentioned objectives. NAADS is guided by the following principles:

- empowering the farmers in agricultural advisory processes and building demand for both research and agricultural advisory services.
- targeting agricultural services to the poor farmers who constitute the majority.
- mainstreaming gender issues
- deepening decentralization to bring the control of the services, research and advisory services, nearer to the farmers
- commercialization-including intensification of productivity and specialization
- participatory processes in planning, contracting, monitoring and evaluation
- managing natural resource productivity
- increasing institutional efficiency through contracting out services, better linkages between research advisors
- harmonization of donor supported projects with PMA principles

Structuring and Implementation of the NAADS Programme

NAADS operates within the structures of the local government (LoG) system and farmer institutions. All NAADS activities including financial administration, procurement, monitoring and evaluation and coordination are under the LoG structures. District officials directly responsible for

implementation of NAADS, include the district NAADS Coordinator (DNC) the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), the Chief Finance Officer, Internal Auditor, District Planner and technical staff in agriculture (production, veterinary, and entomology). Also, at district level there is the NAADS District Farmer Forum (DFF), which comprises the chairpersons of the sub-county Farmers fora (FF), the Secretary of Production LC V, and the DNC.

The bulk of NAADS implementation is at the sub-county level where the key players include the Sub-county NAADS Coordinator (SNC) sub county Chief (SC), Service Providers (Private Companies), FF, and the farmers. According to the NAADS implementation system, SNCs are usually Sub-county extension (veterinary or crop) officials who are assigned the extra duties of SNC. The SNCs are not paid a salary but various allowances. NAADS institutions at the sub-county include: Sub-county Farmer Forum (SFF) and Sub-county Procurement Committee (SPC). The Savings and Credit Cooperative organization (SACCOS) are the other institutions, which have evolved as part of the NAADS implementation.

The SFF with a total membership of 15 persons derives membership of at least one farmer from each parish of the sub-county. Other members on the SFF include local council (LC) 3, Secretary of production and the SNC. The activities of SFF, among others, include the monitoring and reporting of the establishment, registration, physical and financial performance of the Farmers' Groups (FGs), FF and service providers in the sub-county.

The SPC constitutes 5 members: the three members of the SFF and the SNC and the chairperson of the SFF. The functions of the NAADS SPC among others include: issuance of bid documents, receive and evaluate bids, award contracts

for provision of goods and services, and ensure contract documents are in line with the award decision.

Also NAADS has institutions at parish level that include the Parish Coordination Committee (PCC) and Community Based Facilitator (CBF). The PCC, which comprises about 9 members, is charged with duties including: mobilization of FGs to meet their counter-funding of NAADS activities, general M&E of NAADS activities, and assist in the recovery of revolving funds. The CBFs, on the other hand, are responsible for nurturing FGs through provision of extension advice, training, and lead in participatory M&E.

The SC, who is the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) in the LoG structures, is the accounting officer of NAADS funds. Also, the SC has a host of other duties in relation to NAADS implementation, including: signatory to the NAADS account, the chairperson to the technical procurement committee (TPC), award of contracts to NAADS service providers, and chairperson of the Sub-county NAADS M&E committee.

In the NAADS implementation framework, Service Providers (SPs) are private companies that bid and are contracted to provide goods (agricultural inputs such as seeds) and services (such as technical trainings) to NAADS beneficiaries. On the other hand, the FF is an assembly of the leaders of the FG. In the NAADS implementation framework, the FF is expected on one hand to represent the farmers' demands to NAADS committee and on the other, to oversee the implementation of NAADS. Lastly, the farmers are the beneficiaries of NAADS services, including technologies, training and credit through SACCOS.

Framing, Structuring and Delivery of The NAADS Programme and Poverty Induced Shaming.

Its diverse, ambitious and multi sectoral framework notwithstanding, the framing, structuring and implementation of the PMA/NAADS policy framework has considerably focused on addressing the plight of poor subsistence farmers in rural settings, seeking to transform them into self sustaining progressive farmers.

However our WP2 interviews conducted with both NAADS and non NAADS farmers show that a decade into the implementation of the PMA/NAADS programme attaining the above ideal remains a pipe dream for the rural poor farmers.

In the WP2 research interviewed farmers who had organized and registered themselves into groups to access benefits from NAADS openly expressed frustration, anger and cynicism about the programme. They described NAADS as a programme that was actually designed to benefit the rich and lacking capacity to address even the most basic needs of the poor subsistence farmer. They cited graft especially cronyism and nepotism when it comes to accessing benefits. Many farmers mentioned being on the waiting list for improved crop and animal husbandry inputs for years, and had lost hope. Some saw themselves as worse off than their NAADS counterparts.

Apart from the structural, logistical and other constraints described in accessing NAADS benefits, some farmers described the NAADS programme as an arena of poverty induced shaming. The NAADS meetings, where the poor farmers lack voice, are openly ridiculed and put down by their better off counterparts were particularly singled out as virulent arenas of poverty induced shaming. The open discrimination in allocating inputs in favour of the relatively rich farmers was also described shameful, as the poor farmers attributed it to their poverty and low status in their society.

In WP3 FGDs with richer farmers the challenges confronting their poor neighbours in accessing NAADS resources were acknowledged. However they were but attributed to the design of the programme that they felt ignored the inability of the rural poor, who operate in the vicious cycle of poverty, to effectively participate in such a complex programme. They cynically questioned how for instance a landless and illiterate peasant farmer can benefit from agricultural innovations/technologies like improved seeds, livestock, use of fertilizers, irrigation or pesticides among others.

On the other hand, the non NAADS WP2 interviewees appeared to be contented with their status quo. Many of them did not see any benefits in NAADS adoption and were happy to remain unregistered. This category of interviewees felt at least spared the plight of their counterparts who adopted NAADS, including adverse effects like poverty induced shaming and discrimination and frustration, among others. They were assertive that for the rural poor, who live from hand to mouth and often subsist on casual labour, adoption of programmes like NAADS are meaningless both in terms of agricultural yields and production efficiency- and family well being. Adoption of such programmes they felt, only serves to bring their poverty and hitherto hidden shame and lack of agency to the fore.

In a nutshell the implementation of the NAADS programme posted a shaming potential for the poor and most vulnerable subsistence farmers. This latter category though mentioned in the framing of the policy as core beneficiaries, were not specifically catered for in the policy delivery mechanisms. Their pooling together with other rural but better off farmers was fundamentally flawed as it exposed them to hitherto hidden inequalities and poverty shaming.

In other words for the poorest and most vulnerable farmers, registering with NAADS on top of yielding no tangible production benefits, was tantamount to enduring poverty shaming and other indignities. The rational choice for the poor subsistence farmers has simply been to avoid poverty shame by opting out of the NAADS programme.

Plan to Achieve Prosperity for All Ugandans (BONNA BAGAGGAWALE)

As previously noted, in 2005 the government of Uganda placed renewed emphasis on poverty alleviation under the prosperity for all (PFA) or (Bonna Bagaggawale) programme. PFA encompasses the entire range of the value chain that includes production, microfinance, marketing and processing.

In WP2 research one aspect that the respondents talked about vis-a-vis PFA was the rural financial services; especially the challenges of mobilizing credit to start income generating activities.

Whereas there was unanimity among all respondents that capital (cash) increases one's capacity to acquire agricultural inputs or start a business; and that SACCOS where such capital may be attained have a presence in their communities, the ability of the rural poor to access credit was described as problematic. The few respondents who had registered with SACCOS and obtained small loans described nasty experiences vis-à-vis their inability to service the loans.

This category of individuals vowed never to approach SACCOS or indeed other lending organizations for credit. Those who had never registered with SACCOS or other lending institutions, in similar vein, talked of being scared off. All

these categories of individuals preferred to live in poverty for fear of being shamed and ridiculed in the case of failure to pay back the borrowed funds.

The shaming incidences that were most experienced included confiscation of property including personal effects, prosecution, incarceration and penalties such as being compelled to pay back the loan at higher than the stipulated interest rate.

In the above context SACCOs and other microfinance institutions, despite being a core pillar of the well intended PFA, antipoverty programme were cast in negative light by the targeted beneficiaries who boldly described them as schemes for fleecing the vulnerable, helpless and ignorant rural poor.

In fact components of PFA like SACCOS were widely associated with poverty, hopelessness and shame. In WP2 research very cheap commodities like plastic sandals were derogatorily referred to as *bonna baggagawale* to emphasize the entrenched lack of confidence and skepticism in this government anti-poverty policy/programme meant to address the plight of the rural poor.

Instead of approaching SACCOS a number of respondents had opted for options like borrowing from local revolving funds (*nigina*) or friends and relatives where the risks of exposure to poverty induced shaming are minimal. The enduring question thus is; what needs to be done to address the shaming effects of the PFA policy to render its programmes priority options for rural individuals in need of assistance and determined to get out of poverty? Is it possible to shame proof PFA and indeed other governmental anti-poverty policies/programmes to render them appealing and accessible to the targeted beneficiaries?

Conclusion

A number of anti-poverty policies have been or are under implementation in Uganda, with various levels of success or failure. Given the scope of our research, many of these policies were not explicitly encountered, thus rendering it difficult to make informed comment on the extent to which their framing, structuring and delivery creates or ameliorates poverty induced shaming.

However, analysis of the policies that were adequately encountered vis-à-vis UPE, PMA/NAADS and PFA respectively, strongly suggests that contrary to the objectives of their design, they fall far short of emancipating or liberating the agency of the poor – the primary targeted beneficiaries.

For all the policies analyzed, their framing appears noble, with genuine objectives to address the needs of the poor in a manner that promotes human dignity and gender equality. Though the policies are tagged with a poverty label, it is evident that this was implicit, not in bad faith and at most a mere oversight without capacity per se, to undermine the effectiveness of implementing the programmes.

The real challenges however become manifest in the structuring and implementation of the policies / programmes. The poverty induced shaming effects of the policies have root in the haphazard, headlong fashion in which they were structured and subsequently implemented; in absence of informed and crucial baseline data highlighting the dimensions of poverty that the policies seek to address. It is evident that in respect of all the policies one aspect that was ignored is poverty shame, its insidious indignities and the negative coping strategies the poor adopt to avoid or endure it, including social exclusion.

Our analysis has shown that it is the lack of attention to the role of poverty shame, more specifically how to mitigate it and its insidious effects in the design and delivery of the policies, that has posed major impediments in their implementation processes. The lack luster response of the targeted beneficiaries to the policies/programmes intended to address their plight may be seen in this context.

The only way forward thus appears to be a repackaging of the policies, placing poverty shame at the core of policy framing and structuring and delivery of interventions. Since repackaging of ongoing programmes to render them shame proof is not feasible, the sole option may be ditching the current antipoverty policies altogether and designing alternative ones informed by evidence based poverty and shame research.