

# Uganda - Livelihoods, Basic Services, Social Protection and Perceptions of the State in Conflict-affected Situations Household Survey 2013

**Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium, Feinstein International Center, Humanitarian  
Aid and Reconstruction, Food and Agriculture Organization**

Report generated on: October 27, 2020

Visit our data catalog at: <https://microdata.fao.org/index.php>

## Overview

### Identification

---

#### ID NUMBER

UGA\_2013\_LBSP-W1\_v01\_EN\_M\_v01\_A\_OCS

### Overview

---

#### ABSTRACT

This data is from the first round of a unique, cross-country panel survey conducted in Uganda by the Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC). The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) is the lead organisation of SLRC. SLRC partners who participated in the survey were: the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) in Sri Lanka, Feinstein International Center (FIC, Tufts University), the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Pakistan, Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction, based at Wageningen University (WUR) in the Netherlands, the Nepal Centre for Contemporary Research (NCCR), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

This survey generated the first round of data on people's livelihoods, their access to and experience of basic services, and their views of governance actors. SLRC will attempt to re-interview the same respondents in 2015 to find out how the livelihoods and governance perceptions of people shift (or not) over time, and which factors may have contributed towards that change.

#### KIND OF DATA

Sample survey data [ssd]

#### UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Households

### Scope

---

#### NOTES

- Basic pre-interview data: Information on location of the household, information on respondent and information on interview
- Information on the household: ethnicity, religion, displacement of household
- Basic individual information: Age, gender, marital status, education, school attendance of individuals within the household
- Livelihood sources and activities: Livelihood activities on individuals, migration, main income sources of households, livelihood barriers faced by households, credit
- Food security: food insecurity, who eats first, dietary diversity
- Assets: House and land ownership, usage of land, number of specific assets owned (tools, housing assets, livestock, transport)
- Shocks: experience of different shocks, coping strategies to deal with shocks
- Crimes: experience of different crimes coping strategies to deal with crimes
- Security: self-perceived safety
- Health: Access to and satisfaction with health services
- Education: Access to and satisfaction with education services
- Water: Access to and satisfaction with water services
- Social protection: Access to and satisfaction with social protection services

-Livelihood assistance: Access to and satisfaction with livelihood assistance

-Civil participation and grievance mechanisms: Knowledge of and usage of grievance mechanisms; problems with services; knowledge of and participation in civil participation opportunities

-Perceptions of government: Perception of local and central government (and informal governance actors for some countries)

#### TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Agriculture & Rural Development	FAO	
Food (production, crisis)	FAO	
Land (policy, resource management)	FAO	
Safeguards	FAO	
Access to Finance	FAO	
Nutrition	FAO	
Social protection	FAO	
Infrastructure	FAO	
Water	FAO	
Fragile & Conflict-affected States	FAO	
Community Driven Development	FAO	

#### KEYWORDS

Livelihoods, Food security, Shocks

## Coverage

#### GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

Regional

#### UNIVERSE

Randomly selected households in purposely sampled sites (sampling procedure varied slightly by country). Within a selected household, only one household members was interviewed about the household. Respondents were adults and we aimed to interview a fairly even share of men/ women. In some countries this was achieved, but in other countries the share of male respondents is substantially higher (e.g. Pakistan).

## Producers and Sponsors

#### PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium	Overseas Development Institute
Feinstein International Center	Tufts University
Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction	Wageningen University
Food and Agriculture Organization	

#### OTHER PRODUCER(S)

Name	Affiliation	Role
The Asia Foundation		Survey design

Food and Agriculture Organization		Survey design
Igarape Institute		Survey design

## FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
UK Department for International Development	DFID	Funded the study
Irish Aid		Funded the study

## Metadata Production

---

## METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Office of Chief Statistician	OCS	Food and Agriculture Organization	Adoption of metadata for FAM
Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium	SLRC	Overseas Development Institute	Documentation of the DDI

## DDI DOCUMENT VERSION

UGA\_2013\_LBSP-W1\_v01\_EN\_M\_v01\_A\_OCS\_v01

## DDI DOCUMENT ID

DDI\_UGA\_2013\_LBSP-W1\_v01\_EN\_M\_v01\_A\_OCS\_FAO

## Sampling

### Sampling Procedure

---

The sampling strategy was designed to select households that are relevant to the main research questions and as well as being of national relevance, while also being able to produce statistically significant conclusions at the study and village level. To meet these objectives, purposive and random sampling were combined at different stages of the sampling strategy. The first stages of the sampling process involved purposive sampling, with random sampling only utilized in the last stage of the process. Sampling locations were selected purposely (including districts and locations within districts), and then randomly households were selected within these locations. A rigorous sample is geared towards meeting the objectives of the research. The samples are not representative for the case study countries and cannot be used to represent the case study countries as a whole, nor for the districts. The samples are representative at the village level, with the exception of Uganda.

Sampling locations (sub-regions or districts, sub-districts and villages) were purposively selected, using criteria, such as levels of service provision or levels of conflict, in order to locate the specific groups of interest and to select geographical locations that are relevant to the broader SLRC research areas and of policy relevance at the national level. For instance, locations experienced high/ low levels of conflict and locations with high/ low provision of services were selected and locations that accounted for all possible combinations of selection criteria were included. Survey locations with different characteristics were chosen, so that we could explore the relevance of conflict affectedness, access to services and variations in geography and livelihoods on our outcome variables. Depending on the administrative structure of the country, this process involved selecting a succession of sampling locations (at increasingly lower administrative units).

The survey did not attempt to achieve representativeness at the country /or district level, but it aimed for representativeness at the sub-district /or village level through random sampling (Households were randomly selected within villages so that the results are representative and statistically significant at the village level and so that a varied sample was captured. Households were randomly selected using a number of different tools, depending on data availability, such as random selection from vote registers (Nepal), construction of household listings (DRC) and a quasi-random household process that involved walking in a random direction for a random number of minutes (Uganda).

The samples are statistically significant at the survey level and village level (in all countries) and at the district level in Sri Lanka and sub-region level in Uganda. The sample size was calculated with the aim to achieve statistical significance at the study and village level, and to accommodate the available budget, logistical limitations, and to account for possible attrition between 2012-2015. In a number of countries estimated population data had to be used, as recent population data were not available.

The minimum overall sample size required to achieve significance at the study level, given population and average household size across districts, was calculated using a basic sample size calculator at a 95% confidence level and confidence interval of 5. The sample size at the village level was again calculated at the using a 95% confidence level and confidence interval of 5. Finally, the sample was increased by 20% to account for possible attrition between 2012 and 2015, so that the sample size in 2015 is likely to be still statistically significant. The overall sample required to achieve the sampling objectives in selected districts in each country ranged from 1,259 to 3,175 households.

### Response Rate

---

The required sample sizes were achieved in all countries. Response rates were extremely high, ranging from 99%-100%.

### Weighting

---

Different weights were used for study/district level and village level. Refer to the data in the World Bank Catalog (reference to this study).

## Questionnaires

No content available

## Data Collection

### Data Collection Dates

---

Start	End	Cycle
2013-01	2013-02	N/A

### Data Collection Mode

---

Face-to-face [f2f]

## Data Processing

### Data Editing

---

CSPRO was used for data entries in most countries.

Data editing took place at a number of stages throughout the processing, including:

- Office editing and coding
- During data entry
- Structure checking and completeness
- Extensive secondary editing conducted by ODI

### Other Processing

---

Data entry was conducted by partners upon return from the field. In most cases CSPRO was used to conduct data entry.



## Data Appraisal

### **Estimates of Sampling Error**

No further estimations of sampling error was conducted beyond the sampling design stage.

### **Other forms of Data Appraisal**

Done on an ad hoc basis for some countries, but not consistently across all surveys and domains.