



Hoima (Uganda)

Socio economics						
Total Households covered by the Monitoring	343					
Total heads of household	262					
	Male-headed households	Female-headed households				
% of households male/female-headed	78%	22%				
Average household size	5.0					
Average of children under 11 years old per household	0.93					
Average of people between 12 and 17 years old per household	0.67					
Average of people between 18 and 29 years old per household	0.78					
Average of people between 30 and 59 years old per household	1.5					
Average of over 60 years per household	0.27					
Average household members participating in agricultural activities	2.69					
Average farm productive area	8.37 in acres					
Main source of household income	On-farm activities 79.6% of households					
Income impact sources	Frequency (%)		N			
% of de households whose agricultural income was affected by a climate related event	70.60%		262			
Climate related events that affecetd agricultural incomes	Droughts	84.1%	182			
	Irregular rains	25.5%	184			
	Heavy rains	18.4%	185			
Adoption of CSA practices						
CSA practices addressed in the CSV monitoring	Water terraces					
	Agroforestry (tree planting)					
	Improved intercropping Maize-beans					
	Improved intercropping Maize-cassava					
	Improved cassava (Pest resistant, early maturing, high yielding)					
	Improved Varieties (Biofortified, Pest resistant Seet potatos or Beans)					
	Frequency (%)		N		Households	
Total Households Adopting a CSA practice	85%		262		223	
Total male farmers adopting a CSA practice (vs total men)	83%		226		187	
Total female farmers adopting a CSA practice (vs total females)	74%		227		169	
Male-headed households adopting a CSA practice	89%		204		181	
Female-headed households adopting a CSA practice	72%		58		42	
Adoption of CSA specific practices						
Male and Female-headed households adopting specific CSA practices	Households (N=262)	Percentage of Male-headed households (N =204)	Percentage of Female-headed households (N =58)	Households (N=262)	# of Male-headed households (N =204)	# of Female-headed households (N =58)
water terraces	19%	21%		49	42	7
Agroforestry (tree planting)	25%	27%		65	55	10
intercropping (maize - beans)	27%	26%		71	52	19
Intercropping (maize-cassava)	10%	10%		26	20	6
varieties (pest & disease, early maturing, high yielding - cassava)	54%	59%		142	120	22
varieties (pest & disease, biofortified - sweet potatoes or beans)	54%	54%		140	111	30
Male or Female adopting specific CSA practices	Male (N=222)	Female (N=220)		Male (N=222)	Female (N=220)	
water terraces	20%	16%		45	34	
Agroforestry (tree planting)	27%	26%		60	57	
intercropping (maize - beans)	24%	34%		54	75	
Intercropping (maize-cassava)	10%	16%		23	34	
varieties (pest & disease, early maturing, high yielding - cassava)	58%	46%		130	102	
varieties (pest & disease, biofortified - sweet potatoes or beans)	54%	56%		120	124	

Impacts of CSA practices						
Practice 1: water terraces						
Perceived effect on production		Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
	Male	81%	4%	6%	9%	47
	Female	81%	0%	10%	10%	31
Perceived effect on additional income generation		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	70%			46	
	Female	81%			31	
Perceived effect on improved food security		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	62%			47	
	Female	65%			31	
Perceived effect on increased food diversity		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	85%			47	
	Female	77%			31	
Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	94%			47	
	Female	84%			31	
Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation		Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N	
	Male	2%	33%	65%	48	
	Female	36%	14%	50%	36	
Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation		Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N	
	Male	51%	19%	30%	47	
	Female	48%	19%	32%	31	
Perceived effect on participation and access/control over income generated through the		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	100%			34	
	Female	96%			25	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice		Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N	
	Male	45%	53%	2%	47	
	Female	31%	56%	14%	36	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	90%			20	
	Female	76%			21	
Practice 2: Agroforestry (tree planting)						
Perceived effect on production		Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
	Male	23%	20%	2%	55%	60
	Female	23%	15%	0%	62%	52
Perceived effect on additional income generation		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	18%			60	
	Female	13%			52	
Perceived effect on improved food security		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	33%			60	
	Female	23%			52	
Perceived effect on increased food diversity		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	36%			59	
	Female	29%			52	
Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	47%			60	
	Female	48%			52	
Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation		Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N	
	Male	3%	24%	73%	62	
	Female	16%	53%	31%	62	
Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation		Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N	
	Male	30%	33%	37%	60	
	Female	35%	33%	33%	52	

<i>Perceived effect on participation and access/control over income generated through the</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	100%			11	
Female	100%			7	
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice</i>	Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N	
Male	44%	53%	3%	59	
Female	10%	76%	15%	80	
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	77%			30	
Female	42%			43	
Practice 3: intercropping (maize - beans)					
<i>Perceived effect on production</i>	Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
Male	71%	26%	2%	2%	58
Female	82%	14%	1%	3%	78
<i>Perceived effect on additional income generation</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	84%			58	
Female	71%			78	
<i>Perceived effect on improved food security</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	91%			58	
Female	90%			78	
<i>Perceived effect on increased food diversity</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	91%			58	
Female	78%			78	
<i>Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	57%			58	
Female	87%			78	
<i>Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation</i>	Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N	
Male	2%	41%	58%	59	
Female	3%	28%	70%	80	
<i>Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation</i>	Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N	
Male	19%	62%	19%	58	
Female	33%	37%	29%	78	
<i>Perceived effect on participation and access/control over income generated through the</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	100%			49	
Female	98%			56	
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice</i>	Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N	
Male	15%	83%	2%	59	
Female	31%	66%	3%	80	
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	71%			41	
Female	71%			24	
Practice 4: Improved intercropping Maize-cassava					
<i>Perceived effect on production</i>	Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
Male	88%	8%	4%	0%	26
Female	78%	14%	3%	5%	37
<i>Perceived effect on additional income generation</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	81%			26	
Female	73%			37	
<i>Perceived effect on improved food security</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	85%			26	
Female	92%			36	
<i>Perceived effect on increased food diversity</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	92%			26	
Female	84%			37	
<i>Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability</i>	Frequency (%)			N	
Male	88%			26	
Female	92%			36	

		Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N	
Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation						
	Male	0%	31%	69%	26	
	Female	0%	35%	62%	37	
Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation		Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N	
	Male	28%	40%	32%	25	
	Female	27%	57%	16%	37	
practice		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	100%			22	
	Female	100%			27	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice		Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N	
	Male	27%	73%	0%	26	
	Female	59%	32%	8%	37	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	87%			23	
	Female	66%			32	
Practice 5: Improved cassava (Pest resistant, early maturing, high yielding)						
Perceived effect on production		Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
	Male	91%	5%	2%	2%	133
	Female	87%	2%	1%	10%	107
Perceived effect on additional income generation		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	71%			133	
	Female	56%			108	
Perceived effect on improved food security		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	77%			133	
	Female	78%			108	
Perceived effect on increased food diversity		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	81%			133	
	Female	70%			108	
Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	81%			132	
	Female	87%			107	
		Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N	
Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation						
	Male	0%	35%	65%	130	
	Female	2%	36%	62%	110	
Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation		Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N	
	Male	14%	26%	60%	133	
	Female	15%	46%	39%	109	
practice		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	100%			96	
	Female	100%			62	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice		Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N	
	Male	13%		39%	123	
	Female	16%		31%	125	
Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	71%			31	
	Female	61%			31	
Practice 6: Improved Varieties (Biofortified, Pest resistant Set potatoes or Beans)						
Perceived effect on production		Increase	No effect	Decrease	Can't say (too new)	N
	Male	83%	11%	4%	2%	123
	Female	83%	9%	5%	3%	126
Perceived effect on additional income generation		Frequency (%)			N	
	Male	67%			123	
	Female	50%			125	

<i>Perceived effect on improved food security</i>	Frequency (%)			N
Male	83%			121
Female	74%			126
<i>Perceived effect on increased food diversity</i>	Frequency (%)			N
Male	80%			121
Female	71%			127
<i>Perceived effect on decreasing climate related vulnerability</i>	Frequency (%)			N
Male	58%			122
Female	75%			126
<i>Perception on who does most of the work related to the CSA practice implementation</i>	Did not participate at all	Helped	Did most	N
Male	1%	40%	59%	124
Female	5%	22%	73%	129
<i>Perceived effect on labour time related to the practice implementation</i>	Increased labour time	No effect	Decreased labour time	N
Male	13%	48%	39%	123
Female	16%	53%	31%	125
<i>practice</i>	Frequency (%)			N
Male	100%			82
Female	98%			65
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to implement the practice</i>	Individual decision	Joined decision	Not involved in decision	N
Male	23%	74%	2%	124
Female	29%	66%	5%	132
<i>Perceived effect on participation in the decision to stop implementing the practice</i>	Frequency (%)			N
Male	59%			22
Female	70%			20