

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACTS OF NON-GOVERNMENT  
ORGANIZATIONS ON POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN JINJA DISTRICT.**

**CASE STUDY: BUWENGE SUB-COUNTY**

**BY**

**NAMULAWA MARY**

**BDS/44180/143/DU**

**A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND  
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF  
BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES OF KAMPALA  
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

**AUGUST, 2017**

**DECLARATION**

I Namulawa Mary hereby declare that this Research Report and the ideas contained therein are my personal works.

I solemnly declare that this research proposal has never been submitted to any institute of higher learning before for any award whatsoever.

NAMULAWA MARY

BDS/44180/ 143/DU

SIGNATURE.....



DATE.....

06/09/17

**APPROVAL**

This research Report has been done by Namulawa Mary under my supervision and now it's ready for submission.

SIGNATURE:.....



DATE.....

*6th September 2017*

MR. NUWAMANYA RICHARD

(SUPERVISOR)

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

IMF	International Monetary Fund
NGOs	Non-Government Organizations
NRM	National Resistance Movement
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PPA	Participatory Poverty Assessment
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
WB	World Bank
<hr/>	
NDPII	The national development plan II
HCB-	Human CPAITAL Development
NDPII	National Development plan II

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this piece of work to my parents, my father Mr. Godfrey Wanume, my mother Ms Florence Mukyaala for their tremendous support and guidance in completing my studies .

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I thank Almighty God for His Love, Mercy and blessings to me, Whose power made the completion of this report possible.

A special gratitude to my parents, my father Mr. Godfrey Wanume, my mother Ms Florence Mukyaala and Kambe Kasim, Janat Nansumba, my sisters Aminah, Jovia, Rachael, Edith plus my brothers Nicholas, Jonathan for their tremendous support.

I greatly thank my supervisor Mr. Nuwamanya Richard for his Patience and guidance he has offered to me during my research.

Sincere thanks to all friends Joel, Derrick, Resta, colleagues and well- wishers for their prayers and support to my work. May God bless you abundantly.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	ii
APPROVAL .....	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	iv
DEDICATION .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	x
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of the study .....	1
I. 2 What is poverty? .....	4
1.3 Statement of problem.....	5
1.4 Objectives of the study.....	5
1.5 Key research questions .....	6
1.6 Significance of the study .....	6
1.7 Scope of the study .....	6
1.7.1 Time scope.....	7
1.7.2 Geographical scope.....	7
1.8 Content of the report.....	7
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....	<b>8</b>
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	8
2.0 Introduction.....	8
2.1 The characterization of poverty .....	8
2.2 Poverty trends in Uganda.....	9
2.3 The National Development Plan II (NDPII).....	11
2.4 International Development Assistance has not worked.....	11
2.4.1 Misuse of Funds.....	12

2.5 The Limited Role of NGOs.....	12
2.6 Impact of NGOs.....	14
27 A New Model for Corporate Philanthropy.....	16
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>17</b>
METHODOLOGY.....	17
30 Introduction.....	17
3.1. Research Design.....	17
3.2Area of Study.....	17
3.3 Study Population.....	17
3.4.0 Data Collection Methods.....	17
3.4.1 Questionnaires.....	17
3.4.2 Observations.....	18
3.4.3 Documentary Data.....	18
3.4.4 Focused Group Discussions.....	18
3.4.5 Interviews.....	18
3.5.1 Sample Size.....	19
3.5.2 Sample Method and Procedures.....	19
3.6.0 Data Analysis.....	19
3.6.1. Qualitative Analysis.....	19
3.6.2 Quantitative Analysis.....	19
37 Limitations of the Study.....	20
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>21</b>
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION.....	21
4.0 Introduction.....	21
4.1. Bio data of the respondents.....	21
4.2 The causes of poverty levels and indicators.....	23
4.3 The impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty.....	29



4.4 The challenges and policies that exist or in place put by4 government to fight against poverty.....	37
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b> .....	44
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	44
5.0 Introduction.....	44
5.1 Summary of Findings.....	44
5.2 Conclusion.....	46
5.3 Recommendations.....	46
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	47
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	50
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRES.....	50
APPENDIX II: TIMEFRAME.....	53
APPENDIX III: _BUDGET ESTIMATE .....	54

### **ABSTRACT**

The study carried out was on an assessment of the impacts of NGOs in poverty alleviation in Buwenge Sub County Jinja district. The purpose of the study was to establish the causes of poverty and indicators in Buwenge Sub County. The objectives of the study were to assess the impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty in Buwenge Sub County and to establish the challenges and policies that are put in place by the government to fight against poverty. The study was covering the entire period from the inception of the poverty eradication action plan (PEAP) in 1997 to date. The main focus was to be the operational NGOs, the people living within the vicinity of these NGOs, staff of the NGOs and the community leaders. The findings also revealed that inadequate NGO staff was a problem. Thirty two respondents (23.5%) noted that NGO staff were very few compared to the beneficiaries. This meant that services could not be delivered to the intended beneficiaries as required. The findings of the study also indicated that improved hygiene among the people would reduce the problem of diseases. Money that would be spent on medical care would be directed to improve the standards of living of the people. For example, eating good food and using clean water were suggested. The study also concluded that a combination of all the above mentioned strategies would improve the work of NGOs towards poverty reduction. One strategy may not be successful in isolation but a combination of several strategies would lead to NGOs success in their struggle to reduce poverty, in Buwenge sub-county and other places of Uganda with the problem of poverty.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Background of the study

#### NGOs

Non-governmental organization (NGO) is an organization that is not part of a government and was not founded by states. NGOs are therefore typically independent of governments.

Although the definition can technically include for-profit corporations, the term is generally restricted to social, cultural, legal, and environmental advocacy groups having goals that are primarily noncommercial. NGOs are usually non-profit organizations that gain at least a portion of their funding from private sources.

There are numerous possibilities to classify NGOs. The following are the typologies that the World Bank uses:

**Operational NGOs:** Their primary purpose was the design and implementation of development-related projects. One categorization that was frequently used is the division into relief-oriented or development-oriented organizations; they can also be classified according to whether they stress services delivery or participation; or whether they are religious and secular; and whether they are more public or private-oriented. Operational NGOs can be community-based, national or international.

**Advocacy NGOs:** Their primary purpose was to defend or promote a specific cause. As opposed to operational project management, these organizations typically try to raise awareness, acceptance and knowledge by lobbying, press work and activist events.

NGO sector is now the eighth largest economy in the world — worth over \$1 trillion a year globally. It employs nearly 19 million paid workers, not to mention countless

[See: <http://www.sustainability.com/insight/research-article.asp?id=51>]. NGOs spend about \$US15 billion on development each year, about the same as the World Bank. The NGO movement has been growing rapidly since the 1980s.

The term NGO came into currency at the end of the Second World War, as the United Nations sought to differentiate, between inter-governmental specialized agencies and private organizations. But the movement's origins are much older. The first international NGO was probably the Anti-Slavery Society, formed in 1839. The anti-slavery movement, which reached its height at the end of the 18th century, was the catalyst for many organizations that followed. Other early NGOs grew out of wars, including the Red Cross in the 1850s after the Franco—Italian war; Save the Children after World War I; and Oxfam and CARE after World War II [BSDglobal].

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is now the world's biggest NGO, with an endowment of \$28.8 billion. Some NGOs are sophisticated media darlings; others are waging tireless battles in anonymity at grass-roots level. Some, such as Amnesty International, are membership-based, refusing to accept money from governments or political parties. Others are huge profit-making organisations, which exist purely to lobby on behalf of profit-driven interests.

4-Increasingly, NGOs are becoming tied to governments by way of funding arrangements and contracts for service in 2001 Care International received almost 70% of its \$US420 million budget from government contributions. A 1998 survey showed that a quarter of Oxfam's income came from the British government and the EU. World Vision in the United States collected US\$55 million worth of goods from the US government.

In the same year Medicines Sans Frontières got 46% of its income from government sources [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non>

Governmental organisation]earlier, a six country study of NGO income found that: 'fees for services had increased by 52% and revenue from the public sector by 40%. In the meantime philanthropical income had only increased by 8% [Ibid].

Perhaps the only thing that can be said with any certainty about the NGO movement is that it represents civil society's most visible response to globalization.

There may be a huge area of common interest between the two movements, but industrialization and globalization are two very different revolutions. The respective forms which have evolved (and the resulting cultural differences) often lead to difficulties and tensions. As one union leader put it recently, "The NGO movement may be a great force for change, but it cannot say what that change should be."

Paradoxically, this lack of a unified political voice may explain the dramatic growth of NGOs since the 1980s. As the World Bank and IMF forced cuts in public services, NGOs were encouraged to move in to fill the gaps. They were considered: "the preferred channel for service provision, in deliberate substitution for the state". "The World Bank not only encourages member governments to work with NGOs on development projects, but also directly funds the NGO projects. It is reported that, from 1973 to 1988, NGOs were involved in about 15 (World) Bank projects a year. By 1990 that number had jumped to 89, or 40% of all new projects approved." [Makoba, J Wagona, 2002).

There was no particular logic behind this transition; it seems to serve an ideological purpose rather than an economic one. There was no evidence to show that NGO service provision was cheaper than public provision. In fact:

in the United States, where NGOs have a highly developed role in the provision of services under government contract, they have come under criticism precisely because

they inflate program costs, as well as creating new bureaucratic problems of accountability.”[Cross, 1997] [Eade Deborah & Leather Alan, 2005].

However, the phrase “non-governmental organization” only came into popular use with the establishment of the United Nations Organization in 1945 with provisions in Article 71 of Chapter 10 of the United Nations Charter. Rapid development of nongovernmental sector occurred in western countries as a result of the processes of restructurization of the welfare state.

## **I. 2 What is poverty?**

According to Merriam —Webster dictionary, poverty is the state of one who lacks a usual or socially acceptable amount of money or material possession. At the UN’s World Summit on Social Development, the ‘Copenhagen Declaration’ described poverty as “...a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information.”

According to Wikipedia, poverty reduction (or poverty alleviation) is any process which seeks to reduce the level of poverty in a community, or amongst a group of people or countries. Poverty reduction programs may be aimed at economic or non-economic poverty. Some of the popular methods used are education, economic development, and income redistribution. Poverty reduction efforts may also be aimed at removing social and legal barriers to income growth among the poor.

There are 35% of Ugandans who live on less than one dollar a day [UBOS 2005].

The Human Poverty Index -1 value of 34.7 for Uganda ranks 72 among 108 developing countries for which the index has been calculated.

### **1.3 Statement of problem**

NGOs provide a third approach to development between market-led and state-led strategies. NGOs are one group of players who are active in the efforts of international development and increasing the welfare of poor people in poor countries (Werkeretai2007). It is reported that, from 1973 to1988, NGOs were involved in about 15 (World) Bank projects a year. By 1990 that number had jumped to 40% of all new projects approved.

According to the most recent World Bank survey, about 35% of the 24 million Ugandans live on less than 1US\$ a day and are below the poverty line.

Factors associated with falling into poverty include illness, high health care costs, death of income earners, wars, crop disease, and land exhaustion, and they also include large family size, marriage expenses, and land division (Anirudh Krishna. et al, 2004).

There are various NGOs focusing on issues such as environment, health, education, microfinance, and Research with the basic aim of fighting poverty in Jinja district, however, in the most recent House Hold Survey(UBOS,2008) Jinja was ranked as one of the most poorest in the Eastern region. Therefore, the main interest of this study wilt assess NGOs' impacts in poverty alleviation in the communities they are working in.

### **1.4 Objectives of the study**

#### **General objective**

The study is to make an assessment of the impacts of NGOs in poverty alleviation in Buwenge Sub County Jinja district.

#### **Specific objectives**

i. The study will establish the causes of poverty levels and indicators in Buwenge Sub County.

ii. The study will assess the impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty in Buwenge Sub County.

iii. The study will establish the challenges and policies that are put in place by the government to fight against poverty.

**1.5 Key research questions**

i. What are the causes of poverty levels and indicators in Buwenge Sub County?

ii. What are the impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty in Buwenge Sub County?

iii. What are the challenges and policies that exist or put in place by government to fight against poverty?

**1.6 Significance of the study**

This study was to be of great value to the donors, NGO community, public service providers in exposing the weaknesses encountered in service provision to the people and proposing what then needs to be improved.

It was also be of great value to the policy makers, policy implementations and the community as beneficiaries in taking into consideration the views of the respondents on what ought to be improved.

It will be meant to open further debate on the role of NGOs as "gap fillers" for the shortcomings of the government.

**1.7 Scope of the study**

The study was covering the entire period from the inception of the poverty eradication action plan (PEAP) in 1997 to date. The main focus was to be the operational NGOs, the people living within the vicinity of these NGOs, staff of the NGOs and the community leaders.



The study was to make an assessment of the impacts of NGOs in poverty alleviation in Buwenge Sub County Jinja district.

#### **1.7.1 Time scope**

The study was mainly to be interested in NGOs that have been in operation for the last 5 years: 2003-2008. The study was to cover the period from the inception of the poverty eradication action plan in 1997 to date. The study was likely to take at least one and half months.

#### **1.7.2 Geographical scope**

This study was to be carried out in one of the sub counties of Jinja district called Buwenge. It is located west of Jinja town close to 11 km from Jinja municipality.

### **1.8 Content of the report**

The proposal has three chapters:

The first chapter includes the background and introductory part of the subject with statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, time and geographical scope.

The second chapter includes the literature review that composes of the second hand data obtained from the textbooks, journals, internet, magazines and newspapers. The third chapter includes the methodology to be used in the collection of the data from the field, how data analysis and presentation will be made.

## **CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.0 Introduction**

#### **2.1 The characterization of poverty**

The characterization of poverty by Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) report (1999) distinguishes the chronically poor Ugandans to be predominantly found among: (I) internally displaced persons in areas of protracted violent conflict a; (ii) groups that are marginalized in decision-making processes pertaining to matters that directly affect welfare growth; (iii) the elderly and civil war and HIV/Aids related orphaned children; (iv) people in remote rural areas with limited assets and little access to public social services; (v) residents of areas that are susceptible to natural disasters such as landslides and earthquakes in western Uganda; and (vi) people with disabilities. This is to ascertained by the study whether it's applicable the area of study.

According to Wangwa Rutangye, poverty can be defined as the inability to achieve and enjoy, on a sustainable basis, the basic necessities of life. In Uganda, like many countries in Africa, these necessities include;

- ❖ Clean and safe drinking water
- ❖ Sufficient nutritious food
- ❖ Energy for cooking food and lighting
- ❖ Good shelter
- ❖ Adequate clothing and beddings
- ❖ School fees etc.

Even simple things taken for granted elsewhere, such as, sugar, salt and matches are not easily available to almost 35 % of the families of Uganda. In spite of the abundant natural resources such as fertile land, abundant surface of water and a climate quite suitable for agriculture, many families in Uganda still live in poverty. This is will have to be established by the study in relation to the indicators of poverty within the area of

study. Poverty rates in urban areas were much lower than in rural areas, but were nonetheless substantial. Poverty was widespread in all areas: even in the most prosperous area, Central urban.

According to the most recent World Bank survey, about 35% of the 24 million Ugandans live on less than 1 US \$ a day and are below the poverty line. This is however, a remarkable drop from 51 % about 10 years ago. One of the major causes of this persistent poverty is lack of sufficient knowledge and practical skills on how to use the available resources profitably and sustain them. Factors associated with falling into poverty include illness, high health care costs, death of income earners, crop disease, and land exhaustion, and they also include large family size, marriage expenses, and land division (Anirudh Krishna. et.al, 2004).

The study will also find out whether these causes are applicable to the area of study.

## **2.2 Poverty trends in Uganda**

Uganda became one of the world's poorest countries as a consequence of the prolonged period of economic and social collapse during 1971-85. Uganda remains extremely poor, ranked 158 on the UN human development index, but has sustained a remarkable recovery, with economic growth averaging nearly 7% per annum in the 1990s, inflation contained to single figures, and the proportion of the population in absolute income poverty falling from 56% in 1992/93 to 44% in 1997/98 and, if preliminary figures are confirmed, to 35% in 1999/2000 (Appleton, 2000) Over the 1990s living standards in urban areas rose by over a half, in rural areas by over a third.

All NGOs share several characteristics including dependency on donor funding; the need for self-financing, transparency or accountability to donors and clients; and targeting the needy or marginalized segments of the population or operating in various sectors of society depending on the needs to be met as well as resources available in the local community. The study will be interested to find out whether these are true characteristics of NGOs operating in the area.

According to the most commonly cited estimates, poverty in Uganda declined from 56 percent in 1992 to 35 percent in 2000, and a combination of economic growth and recovery from civil war damage are widely regarded to be responsible for this accomplishment (Appleton 2001a; Collier and Reinikka 2001; GOU 2001). However, reduced poverty in the 1990s may have gone hand-in hand with increased inequality (Appleton 2001b; Deininger and Okidi 2003; Hickey 2003). This has to be proved by this study as to whether there inequalities within the area of study. The degree to which different segments of the population can take advantage of and benefit from further growth-induced opportunities is in doubt (Okidi and Mugambe 2002; Mijumbi and Okidi 2001; Ssewanyana et al. 2004), and the extent to which "sustained growth can facilitate an escape from poverty — even in the longer term — for those left behind is debatable" (CPRC 2004: 67).

**Table 1: Selected indicators of human poverty for Uganda**

Human poverty index (HPI-1) 2004	Probability of not surviving past age 40 (%) 2004	Adult illiteracy (% AGES 15 and older) 2004	People without access to an improved water source (%)2004	Children Underweight for age (% ages 0-5) 2004
72. Uganda (34.7)	158. Uganda (38.5)	136. Uganda (33.2)	99. Uganda (40)	97. Uganda (23)
73. Swaziland (35.4)	159. Coted'Ivoire (38.6)	(35.1)	100. Vanuatu (40)	98. Central African Republic (24)
74. Haiti (35.4)	160. Nigeria (39.0)	138. Malawi(35.9)	101. Tajikistan (41)	99. Namibia (24)
108. Chad (56.9)	1x73. Zimbabwe	164. Burkina Faso (76.4)	125. Ethiopia (78)	134. Bangladesh

Source: UNDO Human Development indicators: Uganda

### **2.3 The National Development Plan II (NDPII)**

Vision 2040 aims to catapult Uganda from a peasant to a modern and prosperous economy. Within this strategic framework, the NDP II identifies enhancing HCD as one of the fundamental pillars poised to drive Uganda's socio-economic development and structural transformation. In addition to HCD, the NDP II key areas of focus include (i) increasing sustainable production, productivity and value addition in key growth opportunities; (ii) increasing the stock and quality of strategic infrastructure to accelerate the country's competitiveness; and (iii) strengthening mechanisms for high-quality, effective and efficient service. The role that human capital plays in the growth and development process cannot be over emphasized. This link has been assessed theoretically from different perspectives. Lucas' (1988) work posits the view that accumulation of human capital contributes to the growth process directly by augmenting labour in the production process. It considers the process of human capital accumulation as a choice that individuals make with regard to work versus the accumulation of skills.

### **2.4 International Development Assistance has not worked.**

International Development Assistance has not worked. There is very little evidence that foreign assistance has made much difference in overcoming the poverty trap in any country. As a consequence of the financial assistance received from international agencies, national governments rely on strategies developed by planners at organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations. There is no shortage of ideas, enthusiasm, and expectations at the planning level, but what is lacking is good execution. The study will be interested to find out whether the projects are planned by the implementers or the financiers.

Planners have no responsibility for ensuring that funded projects meet their goals in the field. Other than requiring periodic written reports and demonstration of individual cases where success has been prearranged, there is little feedback or accountability. Beneficiaries are not in a position to let their views be known, nor do they understand what is expected in the longer run. The study will also find out whether the

beneficiaries are involved in the development of projects meant d for them (Abraham, 2006)

#### **2.4.1 Misuse of Funds**

Government international agencies and donors have spent billions of dollars to address poverty. For example, in rural India, the government spends significant funds on subsidies (for electricity, fertilizer, fuels, etc.), food rations, price supports, land allocation/distribution, job training and financial assistance for initiatives in agriculture and small businesses. Loans from the World Bank and other international agencies and bilateral aid supplement domestic government resources. But who benefits from all these programs and assistance?

The beneficiaries are usually corrupt officials who manage and distribute funds, and landlords and powerbrokers who directly or indirectly extract benefits for themselves.

The study will find out who benefits from such pro- poor projects; it is poor or those who are not meant to benefit.

In India, over 90% of the agricultural land is owned and partly cultivated by less than 10% Of the rural population who are termed farmers; others are mostly laborers. Governments allocate land to the poor, but they are unable to utilize it because of limited water resources, bad soil conditions, and/or the inability to secure credit. Larger subsidies benefit bigger farmers, but the poor do not gain much directly from any government programs (Abraham, 2006).

#### **2.5 The Limited Role of NGOs**

Despite positive contributions, NGOs have not been involved in major developmental undertakings intended to create large employment and wide income generation through sustainable businesses. This is attributable to their lacking good managerial skills and organizational structure to take up business ventures. Further, donor funds are usually restricted to narrowly defined projects. Consequently, the role that NGOs are best suited to play is in support of projects funded by governments and international agencies, or those limited initiatives approved by private donors.

Unfortunately, those NGOs that actually carry out developmental work in the field are stuck within programs specified by planners in developmental agencies and donor institutions. New ideas that deviate from those already specified by planners seldom qualify for any funding. Thus, project proposals are prepared to reflect the requirements set by these planners in terms of methodology and outcomes. There is little initiative from the ground up, and no real feedback. The study was to assess the methodologies used to alleviate poverty whether are applicable to the areas of their operation or not.

Microfinance is not a panacea: The assumption is that poor people can be rescued quickly and easily with a modicum of money. (Microcredit is intended mainly for starting or expanding small businesses run by borrowers.) The claim was that microcredit (loans of around \$100) has lifted tens of millions out of poverty in the developing world. However, assertions that more than 90% of the people who receive microcredit are poor, that most of them succeed in businesses started with these loans, and that they repay the loans at 24% annual interest or higher, go unchallenged.

So far, there has not been any outcry on the high rate of interest. The poor do not have any voice in, or understanding of, financial markets. They are happy to get loans to meet personal emergencies (such as expenses toward surgery, marriage or dowry) or to pay off financial obligations to local money lenders who charge even higher rates. Microcredit intermediaries claim that, this was social entrepreneurship, and not living on the backs of the poor.

The study was to establish the kind of loans offered to the poor and at what interest rates.

They are uneducated and labor for landowners and for the few nearby businesses. At best, they might benefit from the trickle-down effect if landlords and small businesses prosper. These types of activities are unsustainable in the long run. Consequently, less than 2% continue beyond the first three years, and very few succeed in any such

“business” with small amounts of money and little or no support, training, or skills. This has to be proved as to whether it’s applicable to the area of study.

## **2.6 Impact of NGOs**

Quantitative evaluations of the non-governmental organizations sector in general are nonexistent. However, a number of academic studies have estimated the effect of individual projects. For example, several randomized evaluations of local NGOs projects in Kenya and India found that they improved educational outcomes (Banerjee et al., 2003; Kremer, 2003). Kremer, Moulin, and Namunyu (2002) describe a program in which the NGO International Christelijk Steun fonds provided uniforms, textbooks, and classroom construction to seven randomly-selected schools from a pool of 14 poorly performing candidates. This program raised school enrollment and after five years, pupils in the treatment schools had completed about 15 percent more schooling. Not all randomized evaluations of NGOs programs, however, find positive outcomes; some evaluations find no difference (Duflo and Kremer, 2003).

A small critical literature has emerged questioning the effectiveness of NGOs in improving the lives of their intended beneficiaries. For example, Mendelson and Glenn (2002) scrutinize democracy-building NGOs in Eastern Europe and argue that foreign NGOs may have created domestic offshoots that were well-funded but weak in grassroots support. Stiles (2002) has argued that the growth and sophistication of Bangladesh’s NGO sector may cause some of these organizations to seek a greater presence in the public arena (by getting involved in politics) and to pursue for-profit type activities that may have some “unintended and negative” consequences for the lives of the poor (p.835). Relatedly, Gauri and Galef (2005) note that the adoption of micro-finance activities by Bangladeshi NGOs seems to have created incentives for managers of these organizations to maximize the size of their portfolios by targeting wealthier villages.

While this may be efficient in a strictly economic sense, this can mean that activities of NGOs might not reach the poorest individuals. NGOs in both Bangladesh and Uganda do



not appear to locate in the most needy communities (Fruttero and Guari, 2005; BarrandFafchamps, 2006).

Even though evaluation is commonly espoused as a tenet of good NGO work, the collective body of industry evaluations reveals very little about their actual impact (Edwards and Hulme, 1996, p. 4). According to an OECD (1997) survey of such assessments, "there is still a lack of firm and reliable evidence on the impact of NGO development projects and programmes." Most publicly available program evaluations by NGOs—like case studies on a website—are descriptive, rarely contain rigorous statistical analysis, and almost never report strong negative outcomes. A more scientific and transparent approach to these studies might present a clearer appraisal of NGO

programs. There are isolated examples of such evaluations. For example, World Vision Haiti recently partnered up with the International Food Policy Research Institute, Cornell University, and the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance in a five-year comparative study in Haiti to determine whether preventive health and nutrition interventions (where all children receive benefits) are more effective than a recuperative approach (where malnourished children are targeted).

Moreover, assuming one could measure the impact of individual projects, it might be difficult to calculate a net impact across NGO efforts. After all, NGO projects might be substitutes for government services or for-profit activity; program recipients may have a limited amount of time to participate in development outreach; and the opportunity cost of the capital and labor going into the NGO sector is hard to measure. NGOs spend money and hire local labor in poor communities, and this basic economic stimulus maybe a significant spillover benefit.

However, the paucity of clear, objective evaluations should not be particularly surprising. It is in neither the interests of the NGOs nor the official donor agency, complicit as a funder, to publicize less-than-stellar results (Riddell and Robinson, 1995). In addition, public opinion of NGOs is generally very high in rich countries and poor countries alike, so the demand for rigorous evaluation is correspondingly low

(PEW,2002; Barr and Fafchamps, 2006). This study will be interested in assess whether these impacts have been felt within the area of study.

### **27 A New Model for Corporate Philanthropy**

The New Model for Corporate should provide loans at low interest rates directly to local entrepreneurs who can demonstrate an ability to run successful businesses. In short, some of the available developmental funds must be used to support commercial activities in deprived communities. With more economic activity, the poor labor class can gain employment at better wages.

Poverty, in large part, can be solved if the poor gain new skills and if more jobs become available in the rural sector. For some, the solution lies in ownership of a permanent income generating asset: land. The poor need to have the opportunity to own and develop land, and grow profitable crops that can be sold in a competitive market. More money is not a prerequisite for success; proper use of available funds is. There is no substitute for good planning, effective organization and execution with accountability. Only those who bear financial risk can be expected to perform effectively.

Handouts will not solve poverty; neither will it be solved by grand government projects, or by piecemeal interventions of NGOs. Instead, poverty will be solved with vibrant economic activity driven mostly by the private sector.

## **CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY**

### **3.0 Introduction**

This section contained the methods used for data collection and how data was to be presented and analyzed. This study used both the qualitative and quantitative methods of research in both data collection and analysis.

### **3.1. Research Design**

This was carried as Action research in which there will be direct involvement and collaboration of the those whom NGOs are designed to benefit, community members, community leaders and NGO staff specifically those in responsible for designing and implementing projects.

### **3.2 Area of Study**

The area under study was Buwenge Sub County It is 5km away from the Jinja Municipal. It is located at the East side of the Jinja Municipal. The most popular NGO in Buwenge in world Vision.

### **3.3 Study Population**

This study is likely to include about 40 local people in close proximity to the area within which the NGO operate.

These included informants who are Local Council representatives and NGOs staff. At least 2 NGOs were to be considered.

### **3.4.0 Data Collection Methods.**

#### **3.4.1 Questionnaires**

The research had questionnaires that were both open ended and closed ended questions. This was used in the interview sessions.

With the open ended questions, the intention is to record the views of the respondents directly (verbatim) without limiting them to making choice.

While the closed ended questions win have to limit the respondents' answers to options provided for in the questionnaires.

### **3.4.2 Observations**

The researcher had to use the analytical and observatory skills in collecting data especially at the sites or while in the field or example the number of people, structures, and services provided etc.

### **3.4.3 Documentary Data**

This involved reviewing existing data at the district in order to ascertain the number of NGOs, NGO profiles existing within the area.

### **3.4.4 Focused Group Discussions**

This included the local people (beneficiaries), leaders of the communities, district administrators and politicians. The researcher had to facilitate and moderate these discussions by the help of tape recorder and also get assistance with writing down the responses from an extra hand i.e. Assistants.

### **3.4.5 Interviews**

The study obtained data by using an interview instrument that was designed and meant for one on one session to collect data.

### **3.5.1 Sample Size**

This study included about 40 local people in close proximity to the area within which the NGO operate. These included informants who are Local Council representatives and NGOs staff. This is intended to represent the whole population due to lack of resources.

### **3.5.2 Sample Method and Procedures**

The study employed simple stratified random sampling in selecting the local people living in the proximity of the area of operation of the NGOs.

Purposive sampling applied to key informants such as community leaders i.e. Local Council member and district administrators, NGO staff responsible for designing and implementing pro poor projects of whom participated in the Focused Group Discussions.

### **3.6.0 Data Analysis**

This was involved in both qualitative and quantitative analysis of data. The data was obtained by use of questionnaire, interview instruments

#### **3.6.1. Qualitative Analysis**

In the qualitative analysis, the respondents' responses was altered but rather recorded by writing or using tape recorder and later transcribed.

#### **3.6.2 Quantitative Analysis.**

In the quantitative analysis applied to data usually collected by close ended questionnaires. The data was presented in a tabulated form, graphs, pie charts and figures (mathematical figures). This analysis was made possible by suing software packages such as SPSS,

### **37 Limitations of the Study**

This included the details of challenges that were faced in conducting the entire study. However, these cannot be anticipated problems; they have to be met during the course of the exercise.

**CHAPTER FOUR**  
**DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION**

**4.0 Introduction**

**4.1. Bio data of the respondents**

**Table 2: showing Gender of the respondents**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	27	64.3
	Female	13	31.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From table above, it can be noted that Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District, employs both Male and female employees though the majority are Male being represented by 64.3 percent while Female are represented by 31.0 percent. This implies that Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District employs both Male and the Female although there is a difference of 33.3 percent. It is an indication that Buwenge Sub-County Jinja district is not biased in employing

**Table 3: showing age of the respondents**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	20-29	10	23.8
	30-39	13	31.0
	40-49	9	21.4
	50-59	5	11.9
	60 and Above	3	7.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

The Table above shows 40 percent of the respondents who work with Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District had worked between 20 to 60 years, 20-29 year 23.8 percent, 31.0 percent of the respondents were 30 -39 years of experience, 40 — 49 years were 21.4

percent, 11.9 percent of the respondents were also 50 - 59 and finally 7.1 percent were above 9 years of experience valid. Therefore, Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District should uphold the present standard.

**Table 4: showing marital status of the respondents**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Single	11	26.2
	Married	18	42.9
	Widowed	2	4.8
	Separated	5	11.9
	Divorced	4	9.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

In Table above shows 26.2% of the respondents who work with Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District were single, 42.9% of the respondents were married, widowed were 4.8%, 11.9 of the respondents were separated, and finally 9.5% were Divorced.

Therefore, it indicates that the majority were married with 42.9% and the minority were widowed with 4.9% of Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District.



**Table 5: Showing level of education of the respondents**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid		2	4.8
	Certificate	6	14.3
	Diploma	20	47.6
	Bachelors	10	28.6
	Masters	2	4.8
	Total	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

The table above shows 14.3 percent of the respondents who work with Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District were A' level certificate followed by those with Diploma with 47.6 percent, 28.6 percent of the respondents were Bachelors, and finally 4.8 percent who were Masters holder. This means that sub county considers education and experience highly when selecting its employees to ensure quality work. Therefore, Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District should uphold the present standard.

#### **4.2 The causes of poverty levels and indicators**

**Table 6: showing shortage of land**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	7	16.7
	Agree	16	38.1
	Not Sure	4	9.5
	Disagree	8	19.0
	Strongly Disagree	5	11.9
	Total	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 16.7 of the respondents strongly agreed that there was shortage of land 38.1% agreed, 9.5% of the respondents were not sure, 19.0% disagreed and 11,9% of the respondents strongly disagreed the shortage of land by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents agreed and few of them were not sure and this recommends provision of land for the employees in order to improve their performance.

**Table 7: Incidence of diseases**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	17	40.5
	Not Sure	3	21.4
	Disagree	6	7.1
	Strongly Disagree	5	14.3
	Total	Frequency	11.9

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 40.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was a lot of diseases. 21.4% agreed, 7.1% of the respondents were not sure, 14.3 disagreed and 11.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed the shortage of land by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed

and the minority were not sure and this recommend that the company should usually conduct Incidence of diseases

**Table 8: Malnutrition on children**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	9	21.4
	Agree	15	7.1
	Not Sure	3	16.7
	Disagree	7	14.3
	Strongly Disagree	6	100
	Total	40	21.4

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 21.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Malnutrition in children. 35.7% agreed, 7.1% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7 disagreed and 14.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed the shortage of land by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them were not sure and this recommends that the company should usually conduct Malnutrition on children.

**Table 9: Unemployment cause poverty**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	12	28.6
	Agree	13	31.0
	Not Sure	4	9.5
	Disagree	5	11.9
	Strongly Disagree	6	14.3
	Total	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, 28.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that Unemployment caused poverty. 31.0% agreed, 9.5% were not sure, 11.9% disagreed and 14.3% strongly disagreed thus the need for provision of employment opportunities by the government.

**Table 10: Poor soil management cause poverty**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	8	19.0
	Agree	17	40.5
	Not Sure	6	14.3
	Disagree	7	16.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
	Total	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 19.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that Poor soil management caused poverty. 40.5% agreed 9.143% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7 disagreed and 4.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed the shortage, of land by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them strongly disagreed and this recommends creation of awareness about Poor soil management in order to improve the livelihood of the people

**Table 11: showing low incomes cause poverty**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	20	54.8
	Agree	8	19.0
	Not Sure	6	12
	Disagree	3	7.1
	Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
	Total	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 54.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Low incomes which caused poverty. 19.0% agreed 12% of the respondents were not sure, 7.1% disagreed and 7.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed

**Table 12: showing poor roads cause poverty**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	8	19.0
	Agree	13	31.0
	Not Sure	6	19.0
	Disagree	8	11.9
	Strongly Disagree	5	19.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31.0</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 19.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that Poor roads caused poverty. 31.0% agreed, 19.0% of the respondents were not sure, 19.0 strongly disagreed and 11.9% of the respondents disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them strongly disagreed and this recommends that the NGOs should usually construct roads for the good wellbeing of the people

**Table 13: Showing low education causes poverty**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	16	38.1
	Agree	10	23.8
	Not Sure	2	4.8
	Disagree	6	14.3
	Strongly Disagree	6	14.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 38.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that low education caused poverty. 23.8% agreed, 4.8% of the respondents were not sure, 14.3 disagreed and 14.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them were not thus the need for construction of education facilities and provision of expertise.

### 4.3 The impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty

**Table 14: showing NGOs have Provided Monetary benefits**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	12	36.9
	Agree	9	23.8
	Not Sure	06	8.3
	Disagree	9	21.4
	Strongly Disagree	3	4.8
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 36.9% strongly agreed that there was provision of Monetary benefits. 23.8 % agreed 8.3% were not sure, 21.4 % disagreed and 4.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that NGOs have provided Monetary benefits. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed and this recommends Provision of Monetary benefits thoroughly.

**Table 15: Showing NGOs have Provided Water services**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	19	45.2
	Agree	10	30.7
	Not Sure	5	10.1
	Disagree	3	7.1
	Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that 45.2 of the respondents strongly agreed that NGOs have provided water services. 30.7% agreed 10.1% of the respondents were not sure, 7.1 % disagreed and 7.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed and this recommend that NGOs should Provide Water services.

**Table 16: Showing NGOs have Provided Trees**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	21	50.0
	Agree	11	26.2
	Not Sure	12	4.8
	Disagree	4	9.5
	Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 50.0 % of the respondents strongly agreed that NGOs have Provided Trees. 26.2% agreed 4.8% of the respondents were not sure, 9.5 % disagreed and 4.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed thus the need for NGOs to provide trees.



**Table 17: Showing NGOs have provided of education**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	10	23.8
	Agree	13	7.1
	Not Sure	3	26.2
	Disagree	11	7.1
	Strongly Disagree	3	23.8
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that NGOs have provided education. 7.1% agreed, 26.2% are not sure, 7.1% of the respondents disagreed and 23.8% strongly disagreed that the NGOs have provided education. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 18: Showing NGOs have improved on the Health status of the community**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	12	28.6
	Agree	2	28.6
	Not Sure	12	28.6
	Disagree	6	14.2
	Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 28.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that NGOs have improved on the Health status of the community. 28.6% agreed 28.6 were not sure, 14.2% disagreed and 19.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed that NGOs have improved on the Health status of the community. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed

**Table 19: Showing economic diversification**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	20	47.8
	Agree	10	23.8
	Not Sure	3	7
	Disagree	5	11.9
	Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 47.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Economic diversifications. 23.8.% agreed 7% of the respondents were not sure, 11.9% disagreed and 4.8 % of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 20: Showing Involving community in project activities**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	9	21.4
	Agree	19	45.2
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	8	19.0
	Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

From the above table, it indicates that, 21.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was involvement of communities in project activities. 45.2% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 19.0% disagreed and 7.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed the Involving of communities in project activities. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 21: Showing Improvement of infrastructure**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	12	28.6
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	7	16.7
	Strongly Disagree	5	11.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Improvement of infrastructure. 28.6% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7% disagreed and 11.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed the Improvement of infrastructure by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 22: Showing Improvement on hygiene to reduce diseases**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid..	Strong Agree	13	40.6
	Agree	8	19.0
	Not Sure	7	12
	Disagree	5	11.9
	Strongly Disagree	7	16.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 40.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Improvement on hygiene to reduce diseases 19.0% agreed 12% of the respondents were not sure, 11.9% disagreed and 16.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 23: Showing Increase in life span of NGOs**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	12	28.6
	Not Sure	2	4.8
	Disagree	4	9.5
	Strongly Disagree	7	16.7
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Increase in life span of NGOs. 28.6% agreed 4.8% of the respondents were not sure, 9.5% disagreed and 16.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there was increase in life span of NGOs by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 24: Showing Creation of self-help projects**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	18	42.9
	Not Sure	3	7.1
	Disagree	3	7.1
	Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Creation of self-help projects. 42.9% agreed 7.1% of the respondents were not sure, 7.1% disagreed and 2.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 25: Showing collaboration with other stakeholders**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	8	19.0
	Agree	16	38.1
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	12	28.6
	Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 19.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Collaboration with other stakeholders. 38.1% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 28.6% disagreed and 7.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed the Collaboration with other stakeholders by the respondents. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

#### 4.4 The challenges and policies that exist or in place put by government to fight against poverty

**Table 26: Showing inadequate sensitization**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	12	28.6
	Not Sure	3	7.1
	Disagree	9	21.4
	Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was inadequate sensitization. 28.6% agreed, 7.1% of the respondents were not sure, 21.4% disagreed and 2.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there was inadequate sensitization. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 27: Showing Illiteracy**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	10	23.8
	Agree	9	24.1
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	9	21.4
	Strongly Disagree	11	26.2
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that there is Illiteracy. 24.1% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 21.4% disagreed and 26.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there is Illiteracy. This

indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 28: Showing diseases that exist**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	6	14.3
	Agree	17	40.5
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	10	23.8
	Strongly Disagree	6	14.3
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 14.3% of the respondents strongly agreed that there are diseases that exist. 40.5% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 23.8% disagreed and 14.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the Diseases existed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 29: Showing unfavorable weather**

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	13	31.0
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	7	16.7
	Strongly Disagree	4	9.5
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**



From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there is Unfavorable weather. 31.0% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7% disagreed and 9.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed there is Unfavorable weather. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 30: Showing poor soils**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	13	31.0
	Agree	10	26.0
	Not Sure	4	9.2
	Disagree	05	10
	Strongly Disagree	08	23.8
	<b>Total</b>	40	100

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 31.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that there is poor soil. 26.0% agreed 9.2% of the respondents were not sure, 10% disagreed and 23.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there was Poor soils. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 31: Showing short coverage**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	8	19.0
	Agree	16	38.1
	Not Sure	4	9.5
	Disagree	7	16.5
	Strongly Disagree	5	11.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 19.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Short coverage. 38.1% agreed 9.5% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7% disagreed and 11.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there was Short coverage. This indicates that the majority of the respondents agreed and few of them were not sure.

**Table 32: Showing Government interference**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	12	28.6
	Agree	10	23.8
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	9	21.4
	Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 28.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Government interference. 23.8% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 21.4% disagreed and 19.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed there is Government interference. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 33: Showing inadequate staff**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	15	35.7
	Agree	13	31.0
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	7	16.7
	Strongly Disagree	4	9.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 35.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was inadequate staff. 31.0% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 16.7% disagreed and 9.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there is inadequate staff. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them were not sure.

**Table 34: Showing short time of operation**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	7	16.7
	Agree	16	38.1
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	9	21.4
	Strongly Disagree	7	16.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 16.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Short time of operation. 38.1% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 21.4% disagreed and 16.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there was short time of operation. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

**Table 35: Showing Dictation by sponsors**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Valid	Strong Agree	17	40.5
	Agree	11	26.2
	Not Sure	1	2.4
	Disagree	6	14.3
	Strongly Disagree	5	11.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Primary Data 2017**

From the above table, it indicates that, 40.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that there was Dictation by sponsors. 26.2% agreed 2.4% of the respondents were not sure, 14.3% disagreed and 11.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed the There Dictation by sponsors. This indicates that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed and few of them disagreed.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

#### **5.0 Introduction**

This chapter describes the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations

#### **5.1 Summary of Findings**

Expectation for money. Respondents from Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District noted that: "The staff of NGOs calls us for meetings for hours and hours yet they do not give us money or lunch."

The findings also revealed that inadequate NGO staff was a problem. Thirty two respondents (23.5%) noted that NGO staff were very few compared to the beneficiaries. This meant that services could not be delivered to the intended beneficiaries as required.

The findings of the study also indicted that improved hygiene among the people would reduce the problem of diseases. Money that would be spent on medical care would be directed to improve the standards of living of the people. For example, eating good food and using clean water were suggested.

Twenty four (17%) respondents proposed that NGOs should work with other stakeholders like government and community based organizations, private individuals and other available NGOs. This would reduce duplication of services in similar parishes. Many NGOs were operating in Buwenge Sub-County, yet in other parishes they were few or not there, at all.

A short life span was also a hindrance to the work of NGOs. Most NGOs work for a short period of two to five years. Due to low sensitization and inadequate community participation, many projects die off when NGO staff goes away. As a result, there is no sustainability of the project activities they live behind.

Ten respondents mentioned the challenge of dictation by NGO sponsors. Sponsors determine terms of work, life span, type of project, and the beneficiaries. A staff of

NGO noted that: "Our sponsors determine the projects we implement and the people to benefit from them".

It was found out that sensitization was proposed by the majority (88.2%) and thus found to be a major strategy that could improve the performance of NGOs. This came out because most of the respondents claimed that they had heard about these NGOs but did not exactly know what they were doing in Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District. Others confessed that it was their wish to cooperate and work with these NGOs but did not know how to join them or even whether it was possible to work with them (NGO5). Another strategy identified by all respondents (44.9%) was involving the community in all activities of the NGOs (Community participation). This would increase awareness on the NGO activities in the area. One member in Buwenge Sub-County had this to comment: "These NGOs work with well-to-do people, educated, with land, smart and outstanding but they ignore us the poor."

Lack of conservation of soils was also identified as a major source of poverty and the work of NGOs. Land shortage was identified as a major challenge; hence conservation of available small land was proposed to be a good strategy. A respondent from Buwenge Sub-County Jinja District noted; Even if NGOs come, we shall remain with poverty because our only source of income is agriculture yet soil has lost fertility; may be if these NGO could improve on our soils."

Another strategy was economic diversification (61%). This was believed to supplement people's incomes. Widening NGO coverage to other parishes and villages was also emphasized (52.2%).

The findings indicted that many people did not know about these NGOs and the few that knew about them had not benefited because of their (NGO) small coverage. However, according to Buwenge Sub-County LC III chairman, "NGOs are good, they are in Buwenge Sub-County, but people are slow in welcoming them." Therefore, he recommended that people should be sensitized in order to accept and collaborate with NGOs.

Thirty eight respondents (28%) suggested that self-help projects among the people would reduce on poverty. These projects included, among others, poultry, piggery, fishponds and provision of small loan scheme to allow people borrow money on a small interest.

Seventy eight (57.4%) respondents believed that needs assessment was a better strategy. It was believed that before an NGO operates in a parish or village, it was important to carry out participatory needs assessment. This would ensure that most serious problems are solved, However, one NGO staff commented that "it is still a problem for us to deal with problems considered more serious, mainly because donors dictate our coverage and the type of services to be offered." Forty nine (36%) respondents proposed the addition of more staff. It was argued that NGO staff was too thin to reach the whole sub county.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

The findings of the study indicated that a combination of all the above mentioned strategies would improve the work of NGOs towards poverty reduction. One strategy may not be successful in isolation but a combination of several strategies would lead to NGOs success in their struggle to reduce poverty, in Buwenge sub-county and other places of Uganda with the problem of poverty.

## **5.3 Recommendations**

There should be improvement of infrastructure like roads that would ease accessibility and improve on the markets.

There should rural electrification. Others suggested that electricity would help in promoting small-scale industries. However, others looked at it as a very long-term strategy and expensive.

Respondents suggested that government support and collaboration with NGOs would support NGOs in their struggle to reduce on poverty.

Government support involved reduced government interference in NGO activities and desisting from politics in their work.



## REFERENCES

- Appleton, Simon (2001a). Changes in Poverty and Inequality, pp. 83-122. In Ritva Reinikka and Paul Collier, eds., *Uganda's Recovery: The Role of Farms, Firms, and Government* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Appleton, Simon (2001b). *Poverty in Uganda, 1999/2000; Preliminary Estimates from the UNHS*. University of Nottingham, UK.
- Anirudh Krishna, Lumonya Daniel and others. 2004, *Escaping Poverty and Becoming Poor/n 36 Villages of Central and Western Uganda*, Kampala
- Abraham George. 2006. *The Forgotten Face of Rural Poverty*
- Baflerjee, Abhijit, Shawn Cole, Esther Duflo, and Leigh Linden. 2003. "Improving the Quality of Education in India; Evidence from Three Randomized Experiments." Mimeo, MIT.
- BSDglobal. From The rise and role of NGOs in sustainable development. See <http://www.bsdglobal.com/ngo/roles.asp>
- Cross John C, July 1997. *Development NGOs, the State and Neo-Liberalism: Competition, Partnership or Co-conspiracy*. Department of Sociology, The American University in Cairo (published in Proceedings of the Fourth Annual AUC Research Conference. Office of Graduate Studies and Research, American University in Cairo).
- Deininger Klaus and John Okidi (2003). *Growth and Poverty Reduction in Uganda, 1992-2000: Panel Data Evidence*. *Development Policy Review*, 21(4), 481-509.
- Duflo, Esther and Michael Kremer. 2003. "Use of Randomization in the Evaluation of

Development Effectiveness. "Paper prepared for the World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED) Conference on Evaluation and Development Effectiveness in Washington, D.C. 15-16 July, 2003.

Eade Deborah and Leather A Ian. Development NGOs and Labor Unions: Terms of Engagement Ed., Kumarian Press 2005

Fruttero, Anna and Varun Gauri. 2005. "The Strategic Choices of NGOs: Location Decisions in Bangladesh." *Journal of Development Studies*, 41(5): 759- 787.

Gauri, V. and J. Galef. 2005. "NGOs in Bangladesh: Activities, Resources, and Governance." *World Development*, 33 (12): 2045-2065.

Hulme, D. and M. Edwards. 1997. *Too Close for Comfort?: NGOs, States and Donors*. London: Macmillan.

Kremer, Michael. 2003. "Randomized Evaluations of Educational Programs in Developing Countries: Some Lessons," *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 93(2): 102-115.

Kremer, Michael, Sylvie Moulin, and Robert Namunyu. 2002. "Unbalanced Decentralization." *Mimeo*, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Makoba J Wagona. 2002. *Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOS) and Third World Development: An Alternative Approach to Development*. *Journal of Third World Studies*, Spring.

Mendelson, Sarah E. and John K. Glenn (Eds.) 2002. *The Power and Limits of NGOs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Okidi, John A. and Andrew McKay (2003). *Poverty Dynamics in Uganda: 1992 to 2000*. CPRC Working Paper 22 Manchester, UK: Chronic Poverty Research

Centre. ISBN Number: 1-904049-26-5

Okidi, John A. and Gloria K. Mugambe (2002). An Overview of Chronic Poverty and Development Policy in Uganda. CPRC Working Paper 11. Manchester, UK: Chronic Poverty Research Centre

PEW Research Center. 2002. "Pew Global Attitudes Project 44-Nation Major Survey." URL: <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/185topline.pdf>

Riddelt, R.C. and M. Robinson with J.D. Coninck, A. Muir and S. White. 1995. Non-Governmental Organizations and Rural Poverty Alleviation. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-governmental\\_organization](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-governmental_organization)

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/poverty>

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty\\_reduction](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty_reduction)

Uganda Bureau of Statistics. National Household Survey. 2005

United Nations. 2006. "Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme." A/AC.96/1025, September 13, 2006. General Assembly Report.

Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) report (1999)

Wangwa Rutangye Erinah. Globalization and The Role Of Ngos In Poverty Eradication:

Focus On Women's Federation For Peace In Uganda

Werker Eric D and Ahmed Faisat Z, 2007 What Do Non-Governmental Organizations Do? Journal of Economic Perspectives

[wikipedia.org/wiki/Nongovernmental\\_organization#Types\\_of\\_NGOs](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Nongovernmental_organization#Types_of_NGOs) World Bank, Progress Report, 1997, pp. 49-50.

**APPENDICES**  
**APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRES**

Dear Respondents

I Namulawa Mary Reg No: BDS/44180/143/Du, a student of Kampala International University is carrying out a research study on The Assessment of the Impacts of Non Government Organizations in Poverty Alleviation in Jinja District. The purpose of this questionnaire is to get additional information for the study.

The information given strictly going to be used for academic or study purpose and will be kept confidential.

**Section A: Bio data of the respondents**

**1. Gender**

Male  Female

**2. Age**

20-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60 and above

**3. Marital Status**

Single parent family  Child headed family   
Widowed  Polygamous family

**4. Level of education**

Certificate  Diploma  Bachelors  Masters

The Likert scale will be used and this will be

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

(SA)	(A)	(NS)	(D)	(SD)
5	4	3	2	1

You are required to tick the alternative which is most appropriate response to the statement;

**Section B: The causes of poverty levels and indicators of poverty**

SN	Statement	SA	A	NS	D	SD
1.	There is Shortage of land					
2.	There is incidence of diseases					
3.	Malnutrition on children					
4.	Unemployment causes poverty					
5.	Poor soil management					
6.	Low incomes causes poverty					
7.	Poor roads causes poverty					
8.	Low education causes poverty					

**Section C: The Impacts of NGOs in alleviating poverty.**

SN	Statement	SA	A	NS	D	SD
9	NGOs have Provided Monetary benefits					
10	NGOs have Provided Water services					
11	NGOs have Provided Trees					
12	NGOs have Provided of education					

13.	NGOs have improved on the Health status of the community					
14.	Economic diversification					
15.	Improvement of infrastructure					
16.	Improve on hygiene to reduce diseases					
17.	Increase in life span of NGOs					
18.	Creation of self-help projects					
19.	Collaboration with other stakeholders					

**Section D: The Challenges and Policies that exist or in place put by government to fight against poverty.**

S N	Statement	S	A	N	D	S
		A	S	D	D	D
	<b>challenges</b>					
20.	There is inadequate sensitization					
21.	There is Illiteracy					
22.	There are Diseases that exist					
23.	There is UnfaVourable weather					
24.	There is Short coverage					
25.	There is Poor soils					
26.	There is Government interference					
27.	There is Conflicts between staff and beneficiaries					
28.	There is Expectation for benefits like money by beneficiaries					
29.	There is Inadequate staff					
30.	There is Short time of operation					
31.	There is Dictation by sponsors					

## APPENDIX II: TIMEFRAME

The entire exercise is likely to take 6-7 weeks.

The table below shows activity against schedule.

What to be done	Schedule
1. Preparation for and of data collection instrument i.e. introduction letter from the University and the Local council letter of the area of study	15 <sup>th</sup> – 18 <sup>th</sup> March
2. Scheduling for appointments with respondents	17 <sup>th</sup> 19 <sup>th</sup> March
3. Collection of data	22 June 8 <sup>th</sup> April
4. Analysis of data	10 <sup>th</sup> 17 <sup>th</sup> April
5. Management of data	10 <sup>th</sup> 17 <sup>th</sup> April
6. Report writing	20- 28 <sup>th</sup> May

**APPENDIX III:  
BUDGET ESTIMATE**

**This budget is based on the time days scope of the entire project. It will take  
37 days.**

<b>Items</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>
Printing	500/= @ page
Photocopying	100/= @ page
Binding	10,000/=
Typing	500/= @ page
Transport	60,000/=
Food and drinks	50,000/=
Pens, pencils and rubber	2,000/=
Papers	10,000/=
Airtime	20,000/=
Miscellaneous	60,000/=
<b>Total</b>	<b>380,000/—</b>