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Abstract

Relative peace since 2006, after 20 years of armed conflict in Northern Uganda, brings the possibility for the internal displaced persons (IDPs) to leave displacement camps and return to the area of their original residence. Through a standardized survey of 178 individuals from the Gulu district in Northern Uganda, this study examines the needs and prerequisites of return and reintegration.

Lasting peace is the uttermost condition for any other prerequisite of this study. IDPs need the voluntary wish to return, which 75% did indicate since they are longing for their ancestral land to engage in agriculture and want to leave behind the harsh and unfavourable conditions of the IDP camps. The population of the Gulu district has been highly traumatized by the lasting armed conflict, making counselling and psychological treatment of trauma necessary. 1/3 is suffering from nightmares and ¼ fears evil spirits from murdered members of their communities. Over 2/3 of IDPs believe that justice was not achieved. Voluntary movement has to be guaranteed, as the returnees who felt forced to return show significantly high movement between the return area and the old IDP camp and lower ability for reintegration. Although, 90% of the once 1.8 million IDPs have returned, only 50% have been able to fully reintegrate back into a life of social, economic and cultural balance.

The majority from the remaining IDPs are unable to return out of their own strength. 9% percent has lost hope to be able to return, since they cannot find assistance or do not have land to return to. 46% are extremely vulnerable, needing special assistance and tailored interventions, as they lack the financial and human capacity to return. 1/5 of the IDPs do not know the boundaries of their land, and 1/3 are having ongoing land disputes. 42% claim to have no monetary income whatsoever and 16% are unable to supply themselves sufficiently with food. Infrastructure and services need to be re-established, as the lack of shelter, schools, health centres and water sources are the main facilities the IDPs need in their return areas.
Image 1 – Map of Uganda (Conciliation Resources 2001)
1. Initial situation and problem definition

With its terrible and lasting war Northern Uganda was declared “the worst forgotten humanitarian crisis on earth” in 2003 (Agence France-Presse 2003). Northern Uganda has been a unique case, because the conflict lasted for 20 years, making it one of the longest running wars in Africa. Through rebel activities and thousands of abductions of predominantly children, the victims, civilians and perpetrators in this conflict all came from the same population group. War and rebel activities of the Lords Resistance Army (LRA) in Northern Uganda ended in 2006, and relative peace was achieved through a ceasefire and peace negotiations. The more than 1.8 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) began returning to the areas of their origin, leaving behind their life in displacement camps. In mid 2007, about 50% were already in their original villages or in the return process (IDMC 2009). Still, for example in the Gulu district approximately 100,000 people are remaining in the IDP camps facing new challenges. The established infrastructures in the camps are collapsing, as people resettle (New Vision Uganda 2010). The remaining population is in most cases made out of vulnerable people requiring special care, as they are unable to return on their own power.

“Internally displaced persons are not passive “recipients” of assistance and protection, but can and should be key actors in identifying and addressing their own needs. Accordingly, programs responding to situations of internal displacement need to take into account the perspectives and capacities of internally displaced communities (...)” (Norwegian Refugee Council training modules on Internal Displacement)

The humanitarian principles state the need of impartiality. Any and all assistance has to be based upon needs (Sphere Project 2004). As there have been almost two million internally displaced persons, their needs have to be the focus of humanitarian assistance and governmental actions. Since the war ended in 2007, the prerequisites for the return for the internally displaced persons in Northern Uganda are not only essential for the coordination of development for Northern Uganda, but most importantly they are the factors for reintegration of its people. The humanitarian response with actions from the government, UN organizations and Non Governmental Organisations have mostly been focused on the closure of IDP camps and the return of the displaced people. The majority of the population did already return but after their physical movement out of the IDP camps further assistance has been almost nonexistent. After many years of displacement it is unclear how far the
returned population has been able to reintegrate back into their social, economic and cultural status prior to displacement.

2. Goal and aim of study

Through quantitative and qualitative methods this study will provide answers about the needs and prerequisites internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the Gulu district in Northern Uganda face prior to return. Furthermore, the study will evaluate to what extent the already returned population has been able to reintegrate into society outside of the IDP camps. The challenges within the process of return and reintegration will be examined and conclusions for its prerequisites made. The conclusions made from evaluating the extent to which the already returned population has been able to reintegrate into their social, economic and cultural life away from the IDP camps will be used to demonstrate the needs of the IDPs prior to the return of the remaining IDPs.

Consequently, the central research question for this study is the following:

*What are the prerequisites for the return of internally displaced persons in the Gulu district (Northern Uganda) considering the challenges of post-war reintegration?*

Two mayor aspects are resulting and will be covered and discussed:

1. **What are the needs of IDPs who are yet to return?**

2. **How much have returned former IDPs (returnees) been able to reintegrate back into the social, economic and cultural fabric of their original villages and what challenges do they face?**

In this study the term “return” is used to describe the act of an individual living in an IDP camp to go back to one’s original place of residence. Usually this place is the area of origin. If a person leaves an IDP camp and moves to another part of Uganda, other than the former place of residence, it is generally referred to as “resettlement” (Norwegian Refugee Council). Return is the favourable solution to displacement and the majority of the IDPs prefer it to displacement. However, this research paper will make no distinction between the terms return and resettlement and will be used interchangeably throughout this study.
A component for successful return is reintegration, making a close examination of the reintegration process as important as the examination of return. In the context of Northern Uganda reintegration means the entrance back into a state of comfort living in given circumstances of the place of origin and the society surrounding the individuals. Only if reintegration can be achieved the return and resettlement process can be considered successful and sustainable.

3. Research design and Instruments:

The data gathered in this survey was collected in Gulu district, Northern Uganda. A research team of eight local men and women representing the ethnic group of the IDPs and returnees was formed. Members of the team had to comply with the necessary ability to hold the survey in the local Luo language using a standardized questionnaire, a set of questions arranged to collect specific data from respondents. The Luo Multi Media Company Limited broadcasted the need for research assistance on the radio in Gulu town. From 89 Acholi applicants eight people with bachelor degrees in related fields and knowledge about research methods were chosen for this research.

The research team participated in a briefing and training session to become familiar with the questionnaire, interview techniques and the selection of respondents before heading to the field in a two day interviewing procedure.

Each member of the research team was assigned to a specific zone in the IDP camps and return areas. Their task was to randomly select households for interviews in different directions. A household was defined as a group of people generally sleeping under the same roof, eating together and being dependent on each other with a high level of trust. Therefore, a household could be only one individual as well as an entire community.

The questioning was conducted in a one on one confidential setting with the respondent remaining anonymously and their names never being recorded. Neither benefits nor compensations for taking part in the interview were given to the respondents.

As two different sample groups were examined, two separate questionnaires were also designed. The first one focused on the needs and problems of the return and resettlement process of IDPs in the camps, whereas the second one focused on the reintegration of
returnees into rural life and the influence in their social, economic and traditional views when compared to life in the IDP camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design characteristics for the study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>population: Selected were all households residing in IDP camps and return areas in Gulu district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample size: 178 households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondents: One respondent per household, above 13 years of age was randomly chosen representing his point of views and of his entire household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Design characteristics

Due to high illiteracy rates and taking into account that few respondents were able to hold a conversation in English, the research team was translating and explaining the questions in the local Luo language and writing down the responses in English.

The research team consisted of six researchers, two supervisors and two overall managers. The monitoring of the researchers was crucial to guarantee valid information as well as meeting the necessary standards. After each interview the researchers were to write down comments and observations. After each day a general summary of their findings was also obligatory.

3.1 Questionnaires

After completing a broad literature review two sets of questionnaires were designed to capture the areas of interest and secondly, to become aware of arising problems. According to Kuhlman (1991) effective return with sustainable reintegration of internally displaced persons depends on economic, social, political and environmental variables. Therefore, the study tried to gain information in the fields mentioned. As a reference and starting point the questionnaire from the World Food Programme study “Uganda - Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment 2005 was revised and taken into account for the design of this study’s questionnaire (see WFP 2005).

A draft of the questionnaires was discussed in cooperation with local NGOs and experts on resettlement in Northern Uganda. Amendments were made to comply with the cultural and
social circumstances, as well as differences of the Acholi people. The questionnaire was designed in English but was to be translated into the local Luo language so that the Acholi people could understand it and feel more comfortable. A pre-test was carried out in the IDP camps, as it would assists in refining the research instrument and “it is imperative to pretest the instrument in the intended languages and in the particular fieldwork environments. Such pretests may uncover unique difficulties not ascertainable in the original language of the questionnaire” (McKay et al, 1996). Using the results from the pre-Test, the questionnaires were again altered and final changes made to maximize its reliability and validity.

The questionnaires contain quantitative and qualitative methods, as the two methods differ in their aim. Qualitative research tries to find a new approach and new ideas while quantitative research evaluates a given scientific question (Brüsemeister 2008). As new approaches and existing ideas will be examined both research methods are relevant. The stakeholder’s individual perception and interpretation of the problems need to be understood and make qualitative items necessary. In some cases the respondents have to be given the opportunity to answer in their own words. That gives the advantage of broadening the scope of data collected by providing explanatory elements useful for understanding the different dimensions of the needs of the affected population in their resettlement and reintegration process.

3.1.1 The questionnaire for returnees

The questionnaire was designed to gain information about the resettlement process that the respondents had gone through while gathering data about arising problems and evaluating their integration back into rural life.

The first part the questionnaire consists of general demographic questions starting with an opening question about their marital status. In the Acholi culture it is of high importance for the people to be married and to gain respect for it. Since the majority of the people are married, almost all interviewed started with a question to be answered with great pride.

Before displacement Acholi people in Gulu had little knowledge about football and apart from radio broadcast they had no chance to follow the scene. In the IDP camps however, people were living very close together, which enabled a very rapid verbal information exchange. Football from the English premier league has become very important for many people in Uganda. Proudly, they wear jerseys from different teams and players from English teams.
Knowledge about the latest results and speculations of the coming matches mean a kind of social status, especially for Ugandan men. New structures such as video halls using Digital Satellite Television technologies came into existence in IDP camps, charging about an the equivalent of $0.25 USD for watching a full game of the English Premier League or the European Champion’s League.

The questionnaire intended to evaluate how far these new entertainment structures like video halls but also pool tables (billiards), bars and discotheques, available in the camps had been influencing the integration back into rural life, where these structures are generally not available. Especially through a block of the questions requiring respondents to agree or disagree on a scale between one and ten to statements, it was intended to shed light on their ability to reintegrate and the challenges they face.

3.1.2 The questionnaire for IDPs

After a demographic introduction, the questionnaire tries to identify existing groups within the remaining IDP population. Examining the needs and values of these groups prior to a successful return out of the IDP camp, is the major component of this questionnaire. It evaluates the ability to return, financial situation, challenges and problems the IDPs face.

3.2 Choosing the district and the camps

The Gulu district is located in Northern Uganda and was chosen because it was one of the most affected districts of the war with 95% of the population being displaced. Furthermore, Gulu town is the biggest and most important town in Northern Uganda near the IDP camps, that offers special conditions and opportunities to the population (UN World Food Programme 2007).

Within the Gulu district the following two IDP camps were chosen for interviewing IDPs and also for interviewing the returnees who once lived in these camps.
3.2.1 Unyama IDP camp

Unyama IDP camp is located in Pakwelo parish in Paicho sub-county along the main road to the Sudanese border. High traffic to and from Sudan passes near the camp. Some houses near the main road have access to electricity. According to the District Disaster Management Committee who counted IDPs in 2006, the number of IDPs residing in the camp was 26,868. Three bore holes are still functioning in the camp. An estimated 193 households (about 853 people) still remain in the camp as of April 2010. They are mostly composed of Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs), such as people who are physically impaired, orphans, child headed households and the elderly. Furthermore, land owners, businessmen, youth and single women make up another big part of the camp population.

The camp developed structures which are unique in Northern Uganda: The camp is located only about eight kilometres outside of Gulu town and has become a cheap means of accommodation for workers and visitors for Gulu town, as the prices are significantly lower in the camp. The movement between the town and the camp is high. Many IDPs are moving back and forth to their land in the villages to carry out cultivation. Schools, health facilities, entertainment structures and business opportunities are available in camp and attract people to take advantage of them.

The camp area is owned by a national teachers college and some private individuals. Some landlords have started charging rent from the remaining IDPs. The camp is changing into an urban centre making an integration of remaining IDPs a possible alternative to the return process.

3.2.2 Tetugu IDP camp

Tetugu IDP camp is located in Lapainat parish in Koro sub-county about 17 kilometres away from Gulu town. Apart from a few solar panels and diesel generators there is no access to electricity in this camp. According to the District Disaster Management Committee in 2006, 17,225 IDPs were residing in the camp during peak time. The exact number of IDPs still remaining in the camp can only be estimated to some hundreds with at least 50 being EVIs. Private individuals who have not yet started to charge rent from the IDPs own the camp area. The camp operates one remaining functional bore hole, a health centre and a primary and secondary school. As of the Joint Camp Assessment Report of the Gulu District Camp Phase Out Committee from February and March 2010 assessed that the community in Tetugu camp
agreed to the closure of the camp. Therefore, the question of how to bring remaining IDPs to return voluntarily is of high importance.

Image 2 – Map of Gulu town and location of chosen IDP camps for the study

4. Demonstration of results

4.1 Data editing

During war times all questioned individuals for this survey had been affected by displacement. After the ceasefire and peace negotiations from 2006, first IDPs started to move out of the IDP camps. All individuals belong to the same sample group but can be differentiated into IDPs, which are the individuals still residing in an IDP camp, and the returnees, which are those individuals living outside the IDP camp after returning to their original village or resettling to another village.
The two groups were analyzed together for demographics to profile the whole sample group. As the questionnaires differ for IDPs and returnees their frequencies and correlations are examined individually but are compared and analyzed in the last part of this chapter.

All answers were checked for consistency, accuracy, uniformity, comprehensiveness and completeness. Invalid data was sorted out. Only correct data was then put into the statistical analyzing software “SPSS”. Within the program the data was coded, labelled and put into meaningful categories before beginning with the analysis and the review of results. All together 173 valid questionnaires were taken for examination.

4.2 Demographics

4.2.1 Gender and age

The demographics for IDPs and returnees were equally divided. There were slightly more female respondents than male, with ages ranging from 14 to 84 years with an average of 41 years.

Diagram 1 – Gender allocation of interviewed persons
4.2.2 Family structures and marital status

The average household size consisted of three adults and four children although the range was between zero to 15 adults and zero to 20 children in a single household.

The majority of all respondents were married. For interviewed persons below the age of 25, partnering/cohabiting or never being married were predominantly named as their marital status. In 2005, Northern Uganda saw an average of about 615 civilian deaths and 1,200 abductions per month (Bøås, Hatløy 2006). The amount of widows (both male and female) is extremely high, and is a direct result of the armed conflict. About 20% have lost their spouse. In contrast, the Ugandan national average in 2006, where only between four to five percent were widowed (Republic of Uganda 2006: 35).
4.2.3 Education

The general education in the Gulu district is poor. 63% were not able to finish their primary school and 29% of those never even had the chance to attend any school.
A difference in the education can be seen between the two sexes. Women were significantly less educated than men and the number of women who never attended any school was significantly higher than compared to men (Chi-Square Test p=0.016).

Diagram 5 – Comparison of school attendance between male and female respondents (figures in percent)

5. Internally Displaced Persons

5.1 The wish to return and possible alternatives

The desire to leave the IDP camp and to live without displacement was stated by 75% of the IDPs. The 25% who did not want to return stated that they could not find any form of assistance for the return process, or they did not own land, or did not know the exact location of their land. Still, the majority of the 25% stated that they would want to return to their village of origin or another village in order to engage in farming and agriculture if they could. The desire to return was clearly shown, but in some cases overruled by ongoing problems that hinder the return process.
Almost 9% of the IDPs left in the camps had the wish to return but already somehow lost hope since they could not find assistance or they did not have any land to return to. A durable solution has to be found for those individuals and families, as they need help from international NGOs or the Ugandan government.

Some individuals did not want to return because they were taking advantage of the schools in and around the camps. About 9% had no place else to go other than the IDP camp or they had no one to take care of them and therefore, they were afraid of being alone if they return to their villages.

IDPs that do not want to return are most commonly involved in business activities in the camps. Those people plan on moving rather to towns rather than to their villages of origin. They have built up a lifestyle that they can hardly resume in rural areas and they want to keep running their businesses. Being closer to Gulu town. IDPs from Unyama camp seem to have more attraction towards the town than being further away as in Tetugu IDP camp.

The reasons why the IDPs want to return can be split into push and pull factors. Push factors are the conditions of the current place of residence, which the individual sees as unfavourable, driving the individual out of his current place of residence. Pull factors attract an individual to leave the current place of residence for a desired place through emotional or rational causes (Lee 1966).

In the Gulu district, 63% are drawn out of the camp, believing their life will be better after leaving the IDP camp. The most frequent answer with over 50% being a pull factor, was the longing for the ancestral land that they can call home and where farming is possible. Sustaining themselves, and therefore, being independent and free is important for the IDPs. Although, they will have to work a lot harder as they did in the camps, they believe that the hard work will lead them into a better future (Chi-Squared $p<0.00$). After the long period of displacement with insufficient work possibilities, especially IDPs above 25 years of age were keen to cultivate their land. Regarding push factors, the most frequent answer with over 50%, was the harsh and unfavourable conditions in the IDP camps. Overpopulation, poor hygiene, diseases, violence and theft were named predominantly as factors generating the wish to leave the camps. Trying to split all stated factors from respondents into push and pull factors, the pull factors contributing to 63% to the desire for return, are more important than the push factors. When asked where IDPs wanted to return to, 87% stated their village of origin. The place they call home.
5.1.1 Special case: Extremely Vulnerable Individuals

Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) include the elderly, sick, physically impaired, widows, orphans, female headed households and child headed families. They cannot leave the IDP camps, as they need special assistance and tailored interventions. “They lack the financial and human capacity to rebuild their shelter and livelihood in the place of origin, given that the social safety nets that would have held them are either weakened or broken” (World Bank 2008: iii).
Almost half (46%) of the IDPs remaining in the IDP camps can to some extent be classified as EVIs. Although, the degree of disability, age and sickness was not determined, in the eyes of the interviewer, they seemed to be extremely vulnerable. Low income contributes to the incapacity to leave the IDP camps. Furthermore EVIs stated that there was a lack of shelter in the return area almost twice as often as non EVIs. Return and resettlement for EVIs is a matter of material and monetary empowerment as they are significantly poorer than non-EVIs (Chi-Squared Test p=0.002).

Diagram 8 – EVIs among the IDPs (figures in percent)

Diagram 9 – Income difference between EVI and non-EVIs (figures in percent)
5.2 Reasons for IDPs to remain in the camps

Although, many factors generate the wish to return - as described below, factors exist that make IDPs wanting to stay in the IDP camps. These will be demonstrated and discussed here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for IDPs justifying their stay in an IDP camp</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of shelter in place of return</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to facilities in camp (schools, health, water)</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better social support in camp/ lack of social support in area of return</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better security in camp than in area of return</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of water in area of return</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land conflicts</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to business in camp</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Reasons for staying in IDP camps

5.2.1 Lack of housing and assistance

The most common answer for the IDPs justifying that they still reside in a displacement camp is the lack of housing in the area of return. The lack of construction materials, such as grass for roofing, poles and bricks are making the start of the return process extremely difficult. Even if they did have construction materials many IDPs struggle to find support for the construction of their houses. Due to sickness and weakness some are unable to construct themselves. Originally before the displacement, the construction of houses was done with help of the community. Together, a group of people constructed houses for each other.

5.2.2 The hope to receive assistance while staying in camp

Most reasons for remaining in the camps are easily solvable. Programmes to construct houses or delivery of the promised resettlement items which very few received could have a tremendous effect and help to return about a third of the remaining IDPs.
Two cases indicated that they hope to receive a resettlement package if they remain in the camp. Before each interview it was explained that names are not being recorded and there is no way to trace back to a person. Still it can be estimated that the number of unreported cases for staying in camp with the hope to receive material assistance is much higher. Nevertheless, people were not willing to state this because of fear that their chances to receive anything might become smaller.

5.3 Knowing the boundaries of land as a prerequisite for return

Traditionally the elders administered knowledge and possession of land but a large amount of this knowledge was lost in almost twenty years of conflict and cannot be restored (Vexler 2007: 22). 1/5 of the IDPs in Unyama and Tetugu IDP camp do not know the boundaries of their land. Over the years natural borders have changed leaving people unable to recall them. Furthermore people have died with the knowledge without being able to pass it on to their family members. Especially younger IDPs and generally small families (none to four adults) with (none to six children) do not know their land boundaries.

To know exactly where the land of a family is and where the land of another person starts is essential for the return process. People who did not know the boundaries of their land returned significantly less to it (Chi-Squared-Test p=0.001).

Diagram 10 – IDPs Knowing the boundaries of their land

IDPs knowing the boundaries of their land

- 19% no
- 81% yes

Etienne Salborn
5.4 Credit facilities – a possibility for the return progress?

Apart from external help, other ways for the IDPs to raise funds to be able to undergo the return process are possible. Muhammad Yunus received the Nobel Peace Price in 2006 for giving out small loans to poor people in order for them to develop business activities (Yunus 2003). In recent years, microfinance institutions have sprung up all over Uganda giving possibilities for IDPs to also access loans. Therefore, the question if the IDPs do have access to credit facilities was posed to give an answer whether it is possible for them to raise the money themselves through taking loans and then pay it back after a successful return. Credit facilities do not only involve microfinance institutions but it was left to the IDPs to define their access to credit facilities, as there was no specification made but a specification expected from the respondents. Therefore, it included the possibilities to loan money from family members, village banks and revolving funds as well as non-monetary credit in the form of animals or food.

![Diagram 11- IDPs with access to credit facilities](image)

In the case that people had access to credit facilities, the most frequent form was microfinance institutions and banks, but only about 1/3 had access to them. The general income of the people that did have access to credit facilities was four times higher than the average income of the IDPs without any access. That means that the possibility to undergo the return or resettlement process with the help of a loan is not suitable for people with low or no income. They will still depend on external contributions, for example for shelter construction.
Table 3 – Monthly income with respect to access of credit facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Shilling</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly income if access to credit facilities</td>
<td>128300</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly income if no access to credit facilities</td>
<td>30300</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Direct needs of IDPs

More than 1/3 of IDPs named capital as their predominant need for successful return followed by 26% for the need of construction materials. Items for construction, such as grass for roofing, poles, bricks and iron sheets fall under the category of construction material. Only a small percentage named tools, such as hoes and ploughs as their predominant need.

Diagram 12 – Items lacking for return

5.6 What would IDPs spend money on?

Since more than 1/3 stated their need for monetary capital, it is essential to look at what they would need the money for. IDPs were asked what they would spend money on if someone were to give them some money. Purposely, no specification about the amount of the money
was made. The IDPs were given the chance to think about their needs in their own relation to money. If a specified amount of money were to be too little or too high for some IDPs, their answers would not reflect their real needs but be over or under stated.

The wish to start a small business with the money stands out as the most frequent answer for usage of donated money. More than 1/5 of the respondents would spend money for the education of their children. About 16% showed the need for food in this question, which indicates that in their current state they are not able to sustain themselves sufficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving some money to IDPs, they would use it for:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>starting a business</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school fees</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>household utensils</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural products</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelter and/or land</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Items to be used if money would be available

### 5.7 Income activities now and after return

Business opportunities, such as retailing, production of food for selling and offering services, such as hairdressing had become a way to generate income in the IDP camps, as only 36% could still be engaged in agricultural activities to a small extent.

People who were able to make an economic fortunate from their situation in the IDP camps (for example shop owners) were earning well with an average of 233,000 Ugandan Shillings (about $108 USD) per month. This is 3 ½ times higher than the general average of the IDPs with 64,000 Ugandan Shilling monthly (making it roughly one dollar per day).

As some were benefiting from the IDP camps others were suffering tremendously. 42% claimed to have had no income at all. Therefore, they were totally dependent on aid from either family members, friends, the Ugandan government, NGOs or UN organizations in order to survive. As planned income activity after return, 60% planned to engage in
agricultural activities which would give them a chance to return to a stage where they are able to sustain themselves.

6. Reintegration of Returnees

Returnees are the individuals who once lived in an IDP camp and have returned to their original land or resettled to another piece of land. They were examined separately from the IDPs and results are displayed in this chapter of the study.

6.1 Trauma and justice

Armed conflict, rebel attacks, massacres and other happenings occurring in Northern Uganda between 1986 and 2006 left its population in trauma. “(...) 54 per cent of the population suffered from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), while over two thirds showed symptoms of depression, amongst the highest rates ever recorded anywhere in the world” (Roberts et al. 2008: 10).

Justice is an important factor for the healing of traumatic experiences. To break the cycle of violence in Northern Uganda, in 1998 the government tried to introduce an amnesty policy to motivate rebels to stop fighting without having to fear consequences (Allen 2006: 74). Although, it was a great success and thousands of rebels were granted amnesty from the government in the minds of the people the happenings cannot be “forgotten” through an amnesty act. More than 60% believe that justice was not achieved in Northern Uganda.

If a returnee thinks that justice could not be achieved he or she is not willing to accept a former LRA member into the community (Chi-Squared p=0.036). Many people have lost their relatives and children to the LRA and do not want to be reminded of these crimes by having to live close to any former LRA member.
6.2 Spirits

Some IDPs remaining in the camp might not be able to return to their original villages because they fear the spirits, or it brings back horrible memories to them. The Acholi believe that evil spirits exist in the places where someone has been murdered to haunt their murderers. “The majority of Acholi stress the significance of being buried on their birth land. If not, most clans (e.g. the Madi) contend that the deceased’s spirit will exist in an indeterminate state on earth, not reaching the afterlife, persistently haunting his or her respective family” (Allen 1991: 378).

To evaluate the extent to which spirits prevent IDPs from returning and influence the reintegration of returnees into a peaceful life the question about evil spirits was posed. 13% of the respondents did fear evil spirits in the villages and 7% feared them at least a little bit. The extent to which these spirits influenced the daily life and the behaviour of the people fearing them is not part of this study but almost 40% of the people who feared spirits also suffered from nightmares.
This study was able to determine different factors contributing to trauma, as seen in diagram 15 and 16. While 34% of the returnees, who have experienced violence from the LRA suffered from nightmares, 77% of them also believed that justice in Acholi was not achieved.
6.3 Integration and comfort

Integration and in Northern Ugandan context “Reintegration is used to describe the re-entry of formerly internally displaced people into the social, economic, cultural and political fabric of their original community (...) [it] requires access to reasonable resources, opportunities and basic services to establish a self-sustained livelihood in conditions of equal rights with other residents and citizens” (Norwegian Refugee Council training modules on Internal Displacement).

To feel integrated in the community and feel comfortable are important factors for the well being of any individual. Both go hand in hand as integrated individuals also feel comfortable living in the village (Chi-Squared Test p= 0.014). Returnees feel comfortable in their villages because of the freedom they gain. Having the chance to sustain themselves through agriculture and other activities is very important. It is a way forward to a life in peace without congestion in IDP camps and without dependency. The majority of 86% did feel comfortable in their villages. 2/3 of the respondents felt that they were able to integrate back into village life after living in the IDP camp, while 23% were not able to reintegrate fully. 9% of the returnees stated that they have not been able to successfully reintegrate.
Different factors for successful reintegration have been identified and will be covered in this chapter. 14% of returnees stated that they are not feeling comfortable in their return areas. Therefore an investigation about the issues causing return and reintegration to fail, as well as how the return process can be effective is needed.

7.1 Crime

The first factor that is influencing the integration process and indicator for comfort is the issue of crime. Almost half of the returnees fear crimes in their villages. When asked what types of
crime they fear, theft was the predominant answer. With an average walking distance of more than an hour to get to the nearest police station, a feeling of insecurity exists.

7.2 Modern life learnt in camp

The life in an IDP camp differs from the life in rural areas. Many people are living close together in a small area bringing change to social structures. Almost all returnees agreed that during life in an IDP camp, the people in the Gulu district have lost some of their Acholi culture. This part of the study will give explanation why Acholi culture was lost and what has replaced some of it.

![Diagram 18 – Loss of Acholi tradition (figures in percent)](image)

7.2.1 Mobile phones and television

Uganda, being one of the poorest countries in the world does not mean that the latest and expensive technology does not find its way there. Digital Satellite Television on plasma flat screens can be found, as well as the latest mobile phones with wireless internet access. Although only a very small percentage of the population could ever afford anything like the items mentioned, advertisements generate a desire to own these items which would mean social esteem for the owner from the community.

Education plays a mayor role regarding a “western like lifestyle”. First a higher education generally means higher income and therefore, more money is available to spend for modern items like phones and television sets. Secondly, a higher education opens the minds for modernization. 60% of the returnees who finished secondary school and went to university (no matter if they finished their degree or not) indicated to watch TV, compared to only about
2% of the returnees who never went to school. The same situation can be found in the owning of a phone. Among educated persons who went to university 40% owned a phone, whereas only 4% of unschooled returnees owned a phone.

The Overall percentage of returnees in the Gulu district who own a phone was 17%. The reasons they stated for owning a phone were 40% for business related reasons and about 60% for private reasons. The social status a phone means for the owner should not be neglected.

All over Uganda, commercials of the different networks under high competition tell about the latest benefits about owning a phone and help generate the wish for people to be able to own a one. Even if individuals have no access to radio or television the mobile network companies have established a system to reach their potential customers. Houses all over Uganda situated along main roads are being used for advertisements. The companies pay the house owners some money to be able to paint the house in their company colour and add their logo and slogan to it. This procedure is highly accepted by the people because not only do they get financial benefit out of the advertisements on their houses but it also generates colourful streets, as most individuals would not be willing to spend money to paint their houses.

To own a phone has become a symbol of wealth, modernity and gives the owner respect. Similarities can be seen about television and especially towards football. The English Barclay’s Premier League is the most important source for football in Uganda. Many people are great fans of the biggest and most successful teams like Arsenal London, Manchester United or Liverpool Football Club. Knowledge about football and being able to discuss about it also brings respect and has a high social value.

In the IDP camps, people used the enthusiasm about football for their benefit and installed halls with digital satellite television to offer the view of football matches for an entrance fee of usually the equivalent of $0.22 USD per game. These video halls were a great success and generated the accessibility for people to see football matches from Europe. 8% of all interviewed returnees knew that Manchester United was the winner of the 2009 UEFA Champions League.
In return sites, the accessibility of television is not available. Some respondents, mostly below the age of 25 years, indicated that watching football is one of the reasons for them to move between the still existing IDP camps and their village. The younger generation was raised in the camps and watching football became a normal habit for some of them. Returning to the village and leaving the camp life behind could make some people feel uncomfortable and bored in the rural areas without entertainment structures. Not only video halls but also discotheques, bars, pool tables (billiards) and other entertainment structures are non-existent in return sites. 15% of the returnees stated that they do miss television in their villages which means that almost all people who were watching television in the IDP camps (18%) are missing it in their villages. More than half of the returnees who knew that Manchester was the 2009 champion of the UEFA Champions League stated they were also moving between the IDP camps and their villages.
“Many people [...] have grown up in the camps and know little about traditional rural life. Without a legitimate social order kept in place by well-respected traditional leaders, one could easily imagine a situation with an alienated segment of youth. It cannot be overstated that the population emerging out of the IDP camps is significantly different from the one that went into them” (OPM, UNDP 2007: 42).

7.3 Issue of land disputes

One reason for the amount of people who are not yet able to integrate into rural life is land disputes and conflicts. Almost 1/3 of the returnees have still ongoing land disputes. People have learned about the value of land through the displacement and resettlement. Individual and personal ownership of land is now the rule opposed to the communal land ownership before displacement. (World Bank 2008: ii) “Until only one or two generations ago, a person could claim land as his own by settling on and cultivating virgin land” (OPM, UNDP 2007: 31).

In Acholi tradition land was communally owned. Clan leaders accepted the boundaries and the family leaders knew their land and the boundaries and passed the knowledge to the sons who were to inherit the land. Living in the camps and within the return process the people in Acholi have learned how valuable land can be. Because it was communally owned, no one made an individual profit out of it before displacement. After displacement, people have been starting to demand land titles and proof of their ownership. Now land is sold for large amounts of money and land is being rented out for usage fees. “With many young people having grown up in the camps, knowledge of customary land law has diminished, including about the rights of widows and orphans, who under Acholi customary law are granted access to land” (Oxfam 2008: 12).
Education plays a major role in the land disputes, as returnees with higher education are having more land disputes than people without education or with only an uncompleted primary school education. Although, this correlation was not so statistically significant (Chi-Squared Test $p=0.054$) it still underlines that people who know about the value of land try to take more advantage of it than people who don’t know.
7.4 Being forced to return and the consequences

Different factors lead to the impression that a person is obliged to leave the IDP camp. Governmental statements as well as the land owners from the IDP camps contribute to a forced return. The feeling that a respondent was forced to return was expressed by 32% of the returnees. A forced return can have bad influences on the person’s life in the return area, as the person was not ready for the return. Two significant influences could be found in this study:

7.4.1 Moving between camp and return site

It can be seen that people who were not yet ready to return but did so because of external pressure, they move significantly more between the area of return and the old IDP camp compared to the people who left the IDP camps purely out of their own choice (Chi-Squared Test p=0.01).

7.4.2 Landmines

The fear of landmines in the return areas was not directly mentioned as a reason for staying in the camps. However, the IDPs who felt forced to return were also the ones fearing landmines. This is a clear indication that even though not mentioned as the most important reason, the presence of landmines does hinder some IDPs to return (Chi-Squared Test p=0.002).

7.5 Trauma hindering integration

Another reason why people could not integrate into rural life after living in the IDP camps is related to the trauma they were exposed to, as described above. Memories from massacres, abduction, rape and other war crimes are still in the minds of individuals and associated with specific places in their villages.

These memories, as well as nightmares bring fear that the LRA might return one day, as their leaders like Joseph Kony could not be arrested but only forced out of Uganda into the Democratic Republic of Congo, where an estimated 400 rebels are hiding and terrorizing the population in Central African Republic, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
Almost all respondents mentioned at one point or another that the future of Northern Uganda will depend on the maintenance of peace.

Nightmares can be a factor in trauma. In the Gulu district a highly significant correlation was found between the state of integration of returnees and whether they suffered from nightmares (Chi-Squared Test $p=0.000$). If a person could not yet feel integrated in their return site they most likely also suffered from nightmares.

8. Governmental approaches

8.1 Distribution of resettlement kits

The Ugandan government launched its Peace Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) in 2007, with the intention to help the development in Northern Uganda over a three year period with a budget of about 600 million US$. The distribution of resettlement kits containing household items, tools and food was one part of the PRDP (GoU 2007).
Most of the IDPs agreed to the statement, that because of IDP camps the corruption in Acholi is higher. A lot of funds from international NGOs and UN organizations were to be spent on humanitarian aid and development in Northern Uganda, but not all the money was used for those purposes. Individuals enjoying important positions took advantage of the situation and used the money for their own benefit. No returnee admitted that a resettlement kit from the Ugandan government was received. Although as many resettlement packages as claimed were not distributed in 2007, it is unlikely that no one received anything from our sample group. Although, since respondents remain anonymous, the denial is based on the fear that their chances to receiving future donations from the government would be a lot smaller if they admitted they had already received something.
9. Comparison of IDPs and returnees

Many similarities in the responses between the IDPs and returnees were found. Still, some significant differences occurred and will be demonstrated in this chapter.

9.1 Nightmares

A highly significant difference can be seen in the suffering of nightmares between IDPs and returnees (Chi-Squared Test $p < 0.000$). It appears that IDPs suffer a lot more from nightmares than returnees.

![Diagram 23 – Returnees and IDPs suffering from nightmares (figures in percent)](image)

9.2 Income

The average income of the IDPs was 64,000 Ugandan shilling per month which at the time of research equalled about $30 USD, making it roughly one dollar per day. The average stated income of the returnees was 39,500 Ugandan shilling per month which equalled about $18.50 USD, making a lot less than one dollar a day.
42% of IDPs stated that they had no income whatsoever, compared to only 16% of the returnees. Income after return is lower than in IDP camps but also more equally distributed. 58% of the IDPs generated on average more income than the average income of the returnees.

![Diagram 24 – Income of IDPs and returnees (figures in percent)](image)

This difference in income is highly significant (Chi-Squared Test p< 0.00). Agricultural possibilities in return areas lower the percentage of the people having no income at all but also lower the average income compared to the business opportunities that were found in the IDP camps.

Although, only few IDPs were able to benefit from these business opportunities over 2/3 agreed to the statement that more business opportunities were available in the IDP camp compared to the return area.
In the IDP camps have been more business opportunities

Diagram 25 – Business opportunities (figures in percent)

9.3 Crime

A significant difference in the fear of crime, especially theft and rape, exists between the IDP camps and the return sites (Chi-Squared Test \( p<0.00 \)). Although, in return sites crime is still existent and can make returnees feel uncomfortable and unsafe it is a lot more common in the IDP camps, where more than half of the population fears crime.

Diagram 26 – IDPs and returnees fearing crime (figures in percent)

9.4 Care of Extremely Vulnerable Individuals

A difference in the social role to take care of EVIs was found. Social structures were disturbed during life in IDP camps. Taking care of vulnerable individuals used to be the role
of their family members and surrounding people. International and local organizations supported vulnerable individuals in the camps and over the years, responsibilities for taking care of vulnerable people shifted towards external institutions like the government and NGOs.

While almost half of the IDPs believed that external groups, such as the government, NGOs or the church should take care of EVIs, more than 2/3 of the returnees believed that the family or the whole community has the responsibility to take care of EVIs.

Diagram 27 – The role to take care of EVIs (figures in percent)
10. Discussion

This study was intended to shed light on the prerequisites of successful return considering the challenges of the post-war reintegration after the long term internal displacement in the Gulu district. 75% of the remaining IDPs had the clear wish to end their displacement and take their life into their own hands. The other 25% predominantly could not find any form of assistance for their return and were lacking basic necessity items, which led 9% to lose faith in their ability to return. Credit facilities are not a possible means in this situation and other durable solutions have to be found from international NGOs and the Ugandan government.

More than 1/3 of IDPs named capital as their predominant need for a successful return. Money given out as assistance would mean the IDP could spend it directly on their needs and things such as construction materials (e.g. grass for roofing, poles and bricks). However, the wish to start a small business stands out as the most frequent answer for usage of donated money. It shows the willingness of the people to become independent from external factors, enabling them to sustain themselves by fulfilling all existential needs.

Land disputes have had a tremendous effect on the return process and have led to high tensions. 1/3 of the population still has ongoing land disputes that need to be solved. The Ugandan government tried to establish a clearer framework through their Land Sector Strategic Plan which involves the surveying and registration of boundaries without disputes to gain valuable information for unclear boundaries. This might have been a first step but does not put an end to the land disputes. This study cannot conclude how to end land wrangles in Northern Uganda, but since the issue is highly relevant, further investigation and implementation is urgently needed.

People in the Gulu district have been traumatized, and the more people have been affected by rebel activities, the less likely they are to return. On the other hand, the shorter people were living in an IDP camp, the faster they returned to their original villages after relative peace was established (t-Test p<0.00). This means that the remaining IDP population are these individuals who have been affected most by the war. This can also be seen in that the remaining IDPs are suffering a lot more from nightmares than the returnees. Therefore, assistance cannot be completely withdrawn, and camps officially closed, as the people still residing there are the ones requiring assistance the most.

As seen in diagram 17 the reintegration of returnees has been quite successful. However, two factors have especially been the reason for some individuals not being able to
reintegrate fully. Firstly, forced return hinders the reintegration, because the persons forced were not yet ready to return. Secondly, highly traumatic experiences remain in the minds of the people and without professional psychological care these experiences can hardly be overcome.

11. Final conclusion

Considering the results of this study and the findings from the theoretical approach “Requirements for successful return and resettlement after long term internal displacement: A case study of Northern Uganda” (Salborn 2010)¹ five prerequisites can be concluded. These prerequisites and its factors will be demonstrated summarizing this study and its results.²

Lasting peace is the uttermost condition for return. If armed conflict and rebel attacks will resume in Northern Uganda all other prerequisites for return will be inconsiderable. The ceasefire needs to be maintained and if possible a final peace agreement signed by all involved parties. If this is not possible then a return of the LRA from the neighbouring countries back into Uganda has to be prevented by all means.

Before considering factors necessary to allow return, the willingness and wish to leave the IDP camps is essential. The will is influenced through two major components; the push and pull factors. This study has shown that the pull factors are of greater importance than the push factors. The most frequent answer with over 50% being pull factor, was the longing for ancestral land that they can call home and where farming is possible. Sustaining themselves and therefore, being independent and free is important for the IDPs. Concerning the push factors, the unfavourable living conditions in the IDP camps have been demonstrated and are the most significant push factor.

If willingness to return is given, return becomes a question of abilities. Physical, financial and social requisites have to be fulfilled to allow return. IDPs need a place to return to. Consequently, land (whether their village of origin or other land) and shelter with adequate housing are crucial. Since houses have been abandoned for many years and have been

¹ This study gives a deeper understanding about return and resettlement in northern Uganda in general and a broad literature review.

² For an overview see table 6 found at the end
destroyed, their reconstruction is necessary. This leads to another factor: seed capital and items. The return process will be costly for the IDPs, as they have to construct shelter, buy seeds for cultivation and need general household items and farming tools. These items can be provided through a social collective within the population, or from the government and international organizations. The social collective is also needed for the construction of houses, as they are generally constructed by a group of men.

These findings suggest that even if IDPs are sufficiently empowered, return becomes a matter of infrastructure and facilities. Water is essential for life and safe sources of water need to be within the areas of return. Schools and health facilities have been established in the IDP camps meaning that a return to an area without these structures will make education and medical treatment unavailable. Police presence is also needed, as it generates a feeling of security especially in remote areas where insecurity was stated as being felt. Last but not least roads and path are required to ensure a movement out of the IDP camps.

As demonstrated, especially the younger generation who were born and raised in IDP camps have trouble accepting a life in rural areas without structures from the IDP camps with which they have gotten used to. For them, as well as for Extremely Vulnerable Individuals, who in many cases need special assistance, return might not be the most suitable option. The remaining IDP camps are more and more turning into trading centres and urban areas, whereby the special needs of EVIs and the desires of the youth can be met.

The physical movement out of the IDP camp is only the start of the reintegration process. Return needs to be done physically as well as mentally to be successful and sustainable. This study has indicated the high presence of trauma among the population in Northern Uganda. If over 2/3 of the population in Gulu district believe that there is no justice and 1/3 suffer from nightmares while 1/4 fear spirits from murdered members of their communities, a conclusion can be drawn that counselling and psychological treatment of traumatic experiences is necessary. Only through material development a population who experienced 20 years of conflict (whereby 76% lost a family member to it) cannot be compensated, but need deeper assistance. Unfortunately the Ugandan government has not yet understood this prerequisite for a successful and sustainable return and NGOs have so far only been able to council and cater for the most drastic cases such as former child soldiers and abducted individuals. "For us PRDP will be meaningless as long as it continues to focus on hardware issues like roads, bridges and so on. We want software issues like counselling services, maternal health and adolescent-friendly services for boys and girls. But these have not been reflected anywhere in the framework" (Wambi 2009).
All in all about 90% of the once displaced population in Northern Uganda have permanently left the IDP camps, but being able to fully reintegrate back into a life of social, economic and cultural balance, as it was prior to displacement, could only be achieved by about half of the returned population. For the other half, work still needs to be done and especially the high rate of depression and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder has to be addressed. Amongst the 10% of the remaining IDPs are the ones most affected of the previous war. Their rights need to be respected and assistance guaranteed for their successful return and reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prerequisites of Return and Reintegration</th>
<th>Most Important factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lasting peace</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ceasefire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prevention of a LRA return to Uganda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The wish to return</strong></td>
<td><strong>Push factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(most significant: unfavorable living conditions in IDP camps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pull factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(most significant: desire for freedom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to return</strong> (physically, financially and socially)</td>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Housing and Shelter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seed capital and items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social collective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Governmental directives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and facilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Water supply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Health centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Roads</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Psychological care and counseling of trauma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Structures for youth and EViS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Summary of the prerequisites of return and reintegration and the most important factors
12. Limitations

Although high attention was paid to guarantee valuable and correct data some possible limitations to this study have to be mentioned. First of all this study can only be representative for the district of Gulu. The situation in other districts of Northern Uganda is likely to be slightly different and they might face other requirements than the ones indicated in this study.

12.1 Supervision for data collection

Data collection in sub-Saharan Africa is a challenging task. Local staff is needed for the collection process and their supervision has to be guaranteed. Big international organizations such as the World Food Programme have begun to use GPS systems to track their field researchers in their positions in field research missions, but correct data still cannot be guaranteed to 100% (UNGIWG 2005).

This study did neither have the financial nor the logistical possibilities to make use of technical instruments for supervision. It was the role of research supervisors to ensure all collected data was correct. Interviewers were chosen carefully and instructed sufficiently. Unfortunately two independent research assistants were proven to have filled questionnaires with incorrect and excogitated data. All of their results had to be excluded from the analyzing process. For all other assistants data collection was sufficiently supervised to state its correctness in the process of gathering information. Furthermore all collected data was revised and identified as valid.

Although, measures to detect false information were developed it can not be guaranteed that all given answers were recorded in the way the respondents replied or if judgments and ideas of the research assistants were incorporated into any answers.

12.2 Gender differences

In the Ugandan culture, respect from women towards the men is highly important and therefore, it might have been the case that interviewed women could not tell male research assistants their full truth and their real problems. It would have been important to have
female research assistants as well as men to minimize the gender differences. Unfortunately the two assistants to be proven to have cheated on gathering information were exactly the two female assistants in the research team. Since their information could not be processed and taken into account no information about gender differences towards the research assistants could be made. Views of interviewed women might lack valuable information, which they could not tell to male interviewers.

12.3 Potential selection bias

The surveying in the return sites was focused on the areas close to the IDP camps for logistical and time reasons. Therefore, the answers by the population can only reflect the needs and problems of the households living close to the IDP camps. Although, some individuals were questioned as they were travelling to or from their village further away the study can only be representative for returnees living close to the IDP camps within a radius of about ten kilometres.

The data collection took place between 9.30 am and 4pm on week days. Therefore, enrolled students in secondary school could not be questioned and their views could only be represented by other family members because of their absence during the time of questioning.

There were slightly more female respondents than male respondents, with ages ranging from 14 to 84 years with an average of 41 years. Therefore, the views of children can only be represented through the responses their parents gave for them.

12.4 Sensitivity of the study

Since 95% of respondents stated to have experienced violence from LRA and some even had even traumatic experiences, the sensitivity of the study might make it difficult to generate open and objective information from the respondents. However, it was assured the interviews were in a confidential one on one basis, as to elicit honest and reliable data.

For example, the income the people in Northern Uganda have stated during the survey has a high probability of being lower than their actual income. In Ugandan culture the questions
about income are not as accepted as in western cultures and understatements are therefore common.

12.5 Loss in translation

The questionnaire was developed in the English language but needed to be translated into the Luo language for the IDPs and returnees to understand. Their answers were also given in Luo and had to be translated back into English in order to be recorded. Information might have been lost, altered or understood differently than intended within the process of translation.
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Annex

Survey Introduction

“Hello. My name is …

We are doing a survey on the return process here in Gulu district and I would like to ask you to participate. The survey will take about 10 to 20 minutes. Please answer all questions truthfully. You will not be judged on your responses and we guarantee that your answers will bring no disadvantages for you or your community.

There is no direct benefit, money or compensation for your voluntary participation. You may refuse to answer any question and you may choose to stop the survey at any time. Refusing to participate will not affect you or your family in any way.

However, we hope that the research will benefit Uganda by helping us understand the needs of IDPs and returnees in Northern Uganda. The researchers will keep your responses confidential. You do not need to use your real name in the interview. Your full name will not be written down and there will be no way to identify you afterwards.

Feel free to ask questions at any time.”
Questionnaire for Returnees

Interview Number:__________             Date:________________
Village: __________             Camp:____________
Returnee □     IDP □
Female □     Male □             Time of beginning:__________

Marital status?
□ Married    □ Partner/ Cohabiting    □ Divorced
□ Living apart not divorced    □ Widow    □ Never married

Age (roughly) of interviewed person:______________

How many people are currently living in your household?
Number of Adults:_______
Number of children (below 15 yrs):______

Do you watch TV?___________________________
What do you like on TV?______________________
Which football team do you support?______________
Which team won the championship 2009 in England (UK)?_______________________

Which place do you call home?    □ village of origin    □ IDP camp
                                    □ transitional site    □ other place

How long ago did you resettle?______________
How long were you living in IDP camp before that?______________

General average monthly income in UGX of family (roughly):______________

Level of education of interviewed person:
□ no school    □ some primary P1 to P6 but not P7
□ completed P7    □ Some secondary S1 to S3 but not S4
□ Completed S4    □ some or completed University

Where did you return to?□ Village of origin    □ Other Village
Reasons:

Walking distance (in minutes) to reach next:          Trading centre:       _____ minutes
School:       _____ minutes          Water source:       _____ minutes
Health facility:       _____ minutes          Police:       _____ minutes

Income generating activities of household (DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS):
□ Crop sales    □ Animal sales / animal product sales
□ Fishing    □ Brewing
□ Unskilled wage labour    □ Skilled labour (artisan)
□ Handicrafts    □ Petty trading
□ Seller, commercial activity    □ Remittance / kinship
□ Salaries, wages (employees)    □ Rental of property (parcels, building)
□ Savings, credit    □ Begging, assistance
□ Use of nat. resources (E.g. firewood, charcoal, bricks grass, wild foods, honey, etc.)
□ Government allowance (pension, disability benefit)
□ Others, specify
Are you feeling that you have been forced to return? □ Yes □ No □ undecided

You think you have to work harder in your return site then in the IDP camps to meet your basic needs? Yes □ No □ Reasons:

Taking care of orphans, disabled and elderly you consider to be the role of:
□ family members □ whole community □ government □ themselves □ NGOs, Church

Do you think justice in Acholi has been achieved? Yes □ No □

Can you accept returned LRA members to live in your community? Yes □ No □

Have you received a resettlement package or any other items by the government or NGOs?
□ Resettlement package □ other items from NGO received □ Nothing was received

How often in the last year did you have problems satisfying the food needs of the household?

In your opinion how can remaining IDPs be integrated into their villages?

How do you agree to following statements on a scale between 1 and 10 (circle accordingly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>agree to some extend</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>do not agree at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through IDP camps the corruption in Acholi is higher. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People identify less with Acholi culture now than before living in IDP camps. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Life in the village is harder now than before the displacement. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Corruption has hindered the resettlement process. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

In my village I cannot participate in religious activities in the same amount as I was able in the IDP camp. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People have learnt about their rights from the UN and NGOs during life in camp. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People have lost respect towards the elderly while living in the IDP camps. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

It is difficult for some people to accept the traditional life because they have learnt a modern life in the camps. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Some people are going back from their villages to live in the camps again. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People have benefited from the services in the camps like education and health centres. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

In the IDP camps have been more business opportunities. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People were drinking more alcohol in IDP camps than in the villages. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People have lost Acholi tradition while living in the IDP camps. [ ] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
My future will be better in the village than in the IDP camp.

I have more control of my life in the village than in the IDP camp

Have you had disputes about land? □ Yes and still going on □ Yes but solved □ No

Do you fear landmines and UXOs in your village? □ Yes □ No

Do you feel comfortable in your village? □ Yes □ Somehow □ No
Reasons:

Do you fear evil spirits in your village? Yes □ No □ a little bit □

How well you feel you have integrated in the rural life?
□ very well □ well □ somehow □ not really □ not at all

Do you have experienced violence from the LRA in your village? Yes □ No □

Do you suffer from nightmares? Yes □ No □

Do you fear crime and theft in your village? Yes □ No □
If yes which types of crime

Did you feel safer in the camp or now in the village? IDP camp □ village □

Do you wish you could return to a life in the IDP camp? □ Yes □ Sometimes □ No

Are there roads accessing your village? □ Yes □ No □ few

Do you own a phone? Yes □ No □ if yes, where do you charge it? _______________________
What do you use your phone for?

Do you miss following entertainment structures in village? (tick if yes)
□ Pool table □ Video Hall □ Disco □ Bar
□ Traditional dance □ other:____________________

Are you moving between area of return and camp? □ Yes □ No
If Yes for what reasons?

How do you compare the overall situation of the household NOW with life in camp?
□ Better □ Same □ Worse , Reasons:

In your opinion, how can you predict the future?

Notes, comments and observations: (write on back)

Time:________________________
Interview Number:__________               Date:____ _________
Village: __________                                Camp:____________
Returnee □     IDP □                               
Female □     Male □                               
Time of beginning:____________

Marital status?
□ Married    □ Partner/ Cohabitating   □ Divorced
□ Living apart not divorced □ Widow □ Never married

How many people are currently living in your household?
Number of Adults:_______
Number of children (below 15 yrs):______

How long have you been living in camp?______

Do you want to return?   Yes □ No □
reasons:

You want to return to: □ village of origin □ other village □ town
reasons:

Age (roughly) of interviewed person:______

Is the interviewed person: □ Widow □ Orphan □ elderly □ sick □ disabled

General average monthly income in UGX of family:_______________

Level of education:
□ no school □some primary P1 to P6 but not P7
□ completed P7
□ Some secondary S1 to S3 but not S4
□ Completed S4
□ some or completed University

Do you know where your land is located and its boundaries? □ Yes □ No

Are you feeling that you are being forced to return? □ Yes □ No

In order of importance, what is your households main livelihoods (activities that the household does to make their money and live) NOW? 1st second and third choices
□ Agriculture
□ Unskilled wage labour
□ Trader (Self-Employed, Commercial)
□ Teacher
□ Medical Worker
□ Other government worker
□ Artisan Skilled labor
□ Work for international organization
□ Sale of food aid
□ Other, specify __________________________
If someone were to give you some money to spend on the things that you would need most you would buy:

Why are you still in camp? (DO NOT READ OUT ANSWERS)
□ Insecurity in place of origin  □ Protection / safety in camp
□ Access to business opportunities in camp  □ Children in school in camp
□ Access to health services in camp  □ Access to safe water in camp
□ Access to food aid in camp  □ Housing / shelter facilities in camp
□ Social support in camp  □ Poor health of household members
□ Central/Local government directives  □ Lack of seeds and tools
□ Lack of land in area of return  □ Land conflicts in area of return
□ Lack of Water in areas of return  □ Lack of shelter in place of return
□ Poor road network in places of return  □ Lack of markets in place of return
□ Presence of mines of areas of return  □ Lack of social support in areas of return
□ Other, specify

Are you willing to dig and farm on your land? □ Yes  □ No
reasons:

Do you fear landmines and UXOs in the area of return? □ Yes  □ No  □ a little bit

Taking care of orphans, disabled and elderly you consider to be the role of:
□ family members  □ whole community  □ government  □ themselves  □ NGOs, Church

Do you have access to credit services? □ Yes  □ No
Please specify:

What have you planned as your income generating activities in area of return:
□ Crop sales  □ Animal sales / animal product sales
□ Fishing  □ Brewing
□ Unskilled wage labour  □ Skilled labour (artisan)
□ Handicrafts  □ Petty trading
□ Seller, commercial activity  □ Remittance / kinship
□ Salaries, wages (employees)  □ Rental of property (parcels, building)
□ Savings, credit  □ Begging, assistance
□ Use of nat. resources (E.g. firewood, charcoal, bricks grass, wild foods, honey, etc.)
□ Government allowance (pension, disability benefit)
□ Others, specify

Do you have all the necessary means and tools to do those activities? □ Yes  □ No
If no what are you lacking?

How do you expect the overall situation to be after return?
□ Better  □ Same  □ worse , Reasons:

Do you have construction material in your village? □ Yes  □ No
Specify:
Do you have enough kits and packages to resettle back to your village? □ Yes  □ No
How often in the last year did you have problems satisfying the food needs of the household?

Are there roads accessing your village? □ Yes  □ No

Can you find help to construct your houses and rebuild your village? □ Yes  □ No

Do you have experienced violence from the LRA in your village? □ Yes  □ No

Do you suffer from nightmares? □ Yes  □ No
Do you fear crime and theft in your village? □ Yes  □ No
If yes specify

What needs and problems do you face?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

In your opinion, how can you predict the future?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Notes, comments and observations (write on back page): Time:_____