

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Background	6
The context of the ADA Project	6
The rationale for the Intervention	7
Objectives of the Evaluation	8
Evaluation Process and Limitations	8
Methodology and Data	8
Evaluation findings	8
Demographics	8
Emergency Lifesaving Shelter	9
Conclusions and Recommendation	12
Livelihood, skills development, and training	12
Income Generating Activities	12
Training in Livelihoods and Business Skills	14
Conclusions and Recommendation	15
Sexual exploitation, abuse, and gender-based violence	15
Harmful behavior and violence against women	15
Harmful Behavior and Violence Against Men	17
The justification for Violence against women	19
Gender Equitable Attitude	20
Negative Coping Mechanism	21
Conclusions and Recommendation	22
References	22

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
CDO	Community Development Officer
CREAM	Community Organization for Rural Enterprise Activity Management West Nile
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
IGA	Income Generating Activities
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
MEAL	Monitoring Evaluation Accountability and Learning
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PPS	Probability Proportionate to Size population
PSNs	Persons with Specific Needs
RWC	Refugee Welfare Committee
SGBV	Sexual Gender Based Violence
SPSS	Statistical Packages for Social Scientists
TOT	Trainer of Trainers
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
XML	Extensible Markup Language

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. **3** Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Francis Okello from Varimetrics Group Limited, an external Consultant, who was hired to finalize the evaluation process. He worked under the general guidance of Sam BT. Okello, the MEAL advisor for CARE International, Arua Field office and the MEAL and CARE ADA Project Implementation Team-. We are grateful to the CARE Country Director – Delphine Pinault and CARE Austria’s Christine Braun for providing critical oversight and guidance during this exercise. We also take this opportunity to thank the Project funder, the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) for making resources available for this exercise.

The annexes of this report have been reproduced without formal editing. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of CARE International in Uganda.

Executive Summary

The end line evaluation was conducted in all the intervention areas where the ADA project was implemented. Respondents were sampled from the ten villages of Zone 3 of Imvepi settlement in Arua District. Data collection was conducted between 10th to 14th December 2018 starting with a two-day training for enumerators.

The evaluation relied on data collected by CARE International MEAL Team. This was quantitative and qualitative data. For Quantitative data, Semi-structured interviews were conducted at the household level using Handheld Tablets, programmed with Kobo tool.

The objective was to assess self-reported access to shelter, reported or perceived protection from GBV and sexual exploitation and to measure coverage in access to Livelihood interventions.

Data was collected from 304 refugees and 79 host community members. For the usability of data and a gendered comparison across life stages, the report only presents findings from the refugee's population. The report focuses on three thematic areas, implemented under the ADA project – Lifesaving shelter for PSNs, Livelihood for the youths and Sexual gender-based component targeting the general project beneficiary population.

Findings

Evidence from the quantitative and qualitative interviews indicate that the PSN was satisfied with the provided shelter. The semi-permanent shelter improved security, safety, and feeling of comfort. Compared to the experiences at the time of arrival, the safety and dignity of PSNs have significantly improved, coupled with reductions in threats and vulnerability to violence.

Livelihood support to the youths reached out to a significant number and training in business skills was well attended. The vocational training program did not, however, have a significant reach to the youth. There was high dependency at the household level, especially more reported by the female youths. The evaluation finds access to cash grants at less than 60% and the youth still report high cost of doing business and lack of adequate and ready market as significant challenges in building their enterprises.

The evaluation found a general reduction in most forms of violence. Violence and harmful behaviors specific to locations have also reduced, suggesting that appropriate targeting has been used. In a situation where violence is existent, physical violence is the most reported form. There was a reduction in justification for the use of violence on intimate partner and more so among men. However, among female youth, we did not measure any significant change on acceptance of violence used against an intimate partner, which, considering that this project was primarily a livelihood intervention with some GBV prevention integrated rather than a focused GBV intervention, is normal given the project's time frame. Improvement in the gender equitable attitude was stronger than changes in attitude rejecting the use of violence on an intimate partner. This finding points that in the refugee's population, the transformation of gender norms may take faster pace than changing attitudes regarding violence prevention since most of the refugee population is coming from areas with

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. **3** Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

extremely high prevalence of violence. We also find a decline in the level of self-esteem, especially among female youths, pointing towards inadequate efforts to building of the girls' social and physical assets and strengthening of the girls' agency.

Background

CARE International in Uganda conducted an End line survey for Integrated emergency response projects for South Sudanese refugees and affected host community members (funded by Austrian Development Agency) to gather the end of project - Sex, Gender, and Disability disaggregated data against all indicators included in the final approved proposal for ADA. The objective of the data collection was to assess the extent to which planned targets at both outcome and output levels have been met and to cover all aspects of project design, implementation modalities, targets achieved and to account for any uncompleted activities and deliverables in the projection of results while paying attention to Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability of the changes created by the project intervention.

The ADA project was a one-year project that started on 15th August 2017 and ended on 14th December 2018. The ADA project titled "Integrated Emergency Response for South Sudanese refugees and affected host community members" was implemented in Imvepi refugee settlement, Odupi Sub-county, in partnership with Community Organization for Rural Enterprise Activity Management West Nile (CREAM). The project had a total budget of EUR 650,000 and was designed to reach out to Youths, Men, and PSNs.

The context of the ADA Project

By August 2017, towards the start of the implementation of the ADA project, Uganda was hosting close to 980,000 South Sudan refugees concentrated in several settlements in the West Nile region. Arua district alone was hosting about 198,000 refugees, accounting for 19% of the refugee population. Imvepi settlement in Arua district had been filled up by 110,000 South Sudan refugees. With then the near closure of Imvepi settlement and the opening of the Rhino Extension, Omugo, the humanitarian actors were changing focus to transition and stabilization interventions. Different refugee groups faced unique problems. Persons with specific needs (PSN), for instance, were in urgent need of shelter to protect their health and wellbeing and increase their resilience to risks, including GBV risks.

Continuously high arrival rates from South Sudan had negatively impacted the livelihoods of both refugees and the local population. Many struggled to generate income to complement the inadequate food rations. The Youth were particularly vulnerable to protection/GBV risks related to their socio-economic situation and age, including sexual exploitation, early marriage, and forced recruitment. As displacement is prolonged, risks of inter-community tensions, and conflict due to access to resources, with first incidents already reported from Imvepi.

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

The rationale for the Intervention



Shelter: In line with the government of Uganda’s self-reliance strategy’, upon arrival, refugees are allocated a residential plot (50x50 ft.), and they are expected to quickly construct their house and build a pit latrine for starting a new, settled life. However, due to the inability of some individuals and families such as elderly, persons with disabilities, woman- and child-headed households, etc. to construct their own shelter; CARE and Oxfam through ECHO funding initially constructed temporary shelters for PSN’s. CARE undertook to replace the temporary shelters with more durable structures due to wear and tear caused by wind and heavy rains exposing residents both too harsh weather conditions (heavy rain, strong winds, but also intensive sunshine) as well as to protection risks.



Livelihoods: The government of Uganda regulatory framework enables refugees to pursue sustainable livelihoods, i.e. they have permission to work, and refugees are allocated plots for residence and farming. However, the refugees have to contend with poor soil in and around Imvepi, traditional farming techniques which do not yield sufficient crop yields and increasing tensions among refugee and host communities given the limited availability of land suitable for crop farming. Waged and self-employment components of response programs are also inadequate, with limited access to start-up capital and limited access to financial services severely affecting entrepreneurship efforts, as agencies have mostly focused on immediate lifesaving interventions. Facing food insecurity and insufficient, irregular income, refugees are turning to a variety of coping strategies to cover their basic needs, with some resorting to unsustainable or harmful strategies such as selling of household items to purchase food to supplement their family’s dietary needs.



Protection from sexual abuse and GBV: Risks of GBV, driven by socio-economic and age-specific vulnerabilities, including particularly sexual violence targeting women and girls remains high. The absence of livelihood opportunities, the absence of parental care and early marriage driven by economic factors are considered important risk factors. As a result, many male youths have turned to alcohol and other drug abuse practices; others have joined gangs, increasing the risk of violence against women and girls while some have contemplated going back to South Sudan to join the armed fight. Many adolescent boys and young men are, therefore, at risk of abuse, crimes, and exploitation as well as being recruited as child soldiers or repatriation driven by economic needs, with limited resilience and skills to confront these risks.

Guided by the Government of Uganda’s policy which provides refugees with the right to work, and access land and basic services, the ADA project was designed to address the complex, interlinked needs of those affected by the world’s fastest-growing refugee crisis – both South Sudan refugees and host community members. Specifically, tackling the challenges South Sudan refugees face with regards to accessing safe and dignified semi-permanent shelter, sustainable income, and protection from GBV and other typical risks in one of Uganda’s biggest refugee settlement, Imvepi, in Arua district.

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. 3 Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation was specifically conducted to:

- I. Assess the extent to which the project has performed against its intended objectives.
- II. Identify and document the intended and unintended outcomes, best practices, lessons learned as well as challenges that arose from project implementation.
- III. Assess the efficiency, relevance, and appropriateness of project approaches, models and strategies in the attaining the project goal.
- IV. Assess the extent to which gender was considered throughout the entire implementation of the project.

Evaluation Process and Limitations

The evaluation was conducted in all the intervention areas where the ADA project was implemented. Respondents were sampled from the 10 villages of Zone 3 of Imvepi settlement in Arua District. Data collection was conducted between 10th to 14th December 2018 starting with a two-day training for enumerators. Data analysis and report writing was done by a consultant.

The evaluation had some limitations - the sample size varied (actual versus targeted) and registered nonresponse for some parameters. It is probable that the process of the evaluation could be affected by using the implementing team in collecting evaluation data. The host community data was low (2 men, 2 women, 15 male youths and 60 female youths); This was due to the enumerators unable to access the host communities in the last day of data collection due to a security incident (local communities rioting due to unemployment) in the nearby settlement (Bidibidi) and CARE staff were cautioned not to travel to potentiality risky areas. The consultant determines that the use of the host community cannot adequately permit gendered and respondent category based analysis. This report, therefore, excludes the host community situation. Analysis of the refugee situation is done on the available data, and no data imputation was implemented. The conclusion and recommendation are comprehensible on the available quantitative and qualitative data.

Methodology and Data

The evaluation relied on data collected by CARE International MEAL Team. This was quantitative and qualitative data. For Quantitative data, Semi-structured interviews were conducted at the household level using Handheld Tablets, programmed with Kobo tool. The objective was to assess self-reported access to shelter, reported or perceived protection from GBV and sexual exploitation and to measure coverage in access to Livelihood interventions. Parallel interviews were conducted with one respondent per household. For qualitative data, KIIs and FGDs were conducted to get deeper insights regarding access to shelter, protection from GBV and sexual abuse and Livelihoods Interventions. In addition to taking notes, the discussions were also audio recorded. The evaluation team followed the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD –DAC) framework during this assessment, focusing on Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability of the changes created by the project intervention. The viability of effectiveness and efficiency should be gauged from the end of project report that should be read alongside this report. Analysis was majorly descriptive, although a test of proportion was performed on selected parameters of violence justification to test if the baseline –end line change in proportion was significant.

Evaluation findings

Demographics

The evaluation team interviewed 304 respondents from the refugee population – 60 men, 51 women, 31 male youths, 102 female youths and 60 PSNs. In the demographics, as in Table 1, school attendance was low, especially among PSNs (31.7%). Up to 85.8% had achieved a complete or incomplete primary. A slight

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

majority of the surveyed respondents (50.3%) were household heads, 45.7%, a significantly high proportion revealing a high level of vulnerability. A very large proportion of those who identify as PSNs also identified as household heads at a significant 74.5%. The survey further showed that 17.7% of the surveyed households had a disability and 43.7% were registered as PSN Household.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

	Men N(%)	Women N(%)	Male Youth N(%)	Female Youth N(%)	PSNs N(%)
N	60	51	31	102	60
Ever attended school	56 (93.3)	25 (49)	31 (100)	102 (100)	19 (31.7)
Educational level					
Incomplete / complete primary level	33 (58.9)	22 (88)	27 (87.1)	101 (99)	17 (89.5)
“O” level / Tertiary Institution	23 (41.1)	3 (12)	4 (12.9)	1 (1)	2 (10.5)
Relationship of the respondent with Household head ¹					
Head	51 (85)	38 (74.5)	2 (6.5)	1 (0.9)	43 (71.7)
Wife/husband	1 (1.7)	7 (13.7)	13 (41.9)	85 (83.3)	4 (6.7)
Other relationships	8 (13.3)	6 (11.8)	16 (51.6)	16 (15.7)	13 (21.7)
Current Marital Status of respondent					
Single, (no partner, regular partner/ no regular)	13 (21.7)	5 (9.8)	12 (38.7)	4 (3.9)	13 (21.7)
Married	43 (71.7)	14 (27.5)	18 (58.1)	94 (92.2)	2 (3.3)
Co-habiting / Widowed / Divorced/ separated	4 (6.7)	32 (62.8)	1 (3.2)	4(3.9)	45 (75.0)
Religion					
Catholic	17 (28.3)	10 (19.6)	7 (22.6)	27 (26.5)	18 (30)
Protestant	38 (63.3)	38 (74.5)	24 (77.4)	73 (71.6)	39 (65)
Muslim / Pentecostal/ other religion	5 (8.3)	3 (5.8)	0 (0)	2 (2.0)	3 (5.0)
Household has a member with a disability ²	19 (31.7)	9 (17.6)	5 (16.1)	10 (9.8)	8 (13.3)
Household registered as a PSN ³	21 (51.2)	39 (92.9)	6 (23.1)	12 (13)	52 (100)

Emergency Lifesaving Shelter

According to results in Table 2, nearly all PSNs lived in a temporary shelter on arrival, as is always the design during the emergency phase. In the surveyed PSN population, nearly all were living in semi-permanent mud bricks shelter, 89% of which was constructed and handed over to them by CARE international between May and June 2018. There were also about 11% of PSNs who reports constructing their own shelter.

² Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. ³ Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

⁴ Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

⁵ This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

⁶ Question refers to the current source of income.

⁷ Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Table 2: Access to lifesaving Semi-Permanent Shelter

Shelter Parameters / attributes	N	PSNs N (%)
Respondent was using temporary (Tarpaulin/tents) on arrival	60	55 (91.7)
Temporary Shelter was constructed by CARE International	55	47 (85.5)
Currently lives in a Semi-Permanent(Mud bricks)	60	57 (95)
Semi-permanent Shelter Constructed by CARE International ⁴	57	57 (100)
CARE provided semi-permanent shelter is 2 roomed (3.5m by 5m)	57	54 (94.7)
Lives with other people in the semi-permanent shelter	57	45 (78.9)
Cooks outside the Semi-permanent shelter	57	57 (100)
The shelter has sufficient ventilation	57	55 (96.5)
Semi-permanent shelter provides Privacy	57	56 (98.2)
Felt safe / very safe on arrival	60	3 (5)
Now feels Safe / very safe in a semi-permanent shelter	57	55 (91.7)
Semi-Permanent Shelter has space to the bath that provides privacy	57	54 (94.7)
PSN has been able to carry out maintenance on shelter	57	56 (98.2)
PSN has been able to do the smearing of the shelter	57	56 (98.2)
Talked to CARE volunteer about maintaining shelter	57	43 (75.4)
Expectations / hopes of PSN has been met through the provision of shelter	57	42 (73.7)
PSN does not Intend to move away from the settlement in the next 3 months ⁵	57	56 (98.2)
Compared to temporary Shelter, the semi-permanent shelter		
Provides Security	57	57 (100)
Has improved ventilation	57	57 (100)
Is away from flood plains	57	56 (98.2)
Has Lockable doors	57	56 (98.2)
Has Lockable windows	57	53 (93)
Offers protection from harsh weather conditions	57	56 (98.2)
Has Latrine which is disability friendly	57	57 (100)

The most common type of shelter given by CARE is reportedly a two-roomed semi-permanent shelter of 3.5m by 5m size. Occupancy of the semi-permanent a structure is high with 83.5% of the respondents surveyed currently living with other people in the shelter. The semi-permanent shelter also adequately addressed health-related concerns with over 97% agreeing that their shelter has adequate ventilation and that they cook outside of the shelter. Results from the in-depth interviews with beneficiaries confirm that the shelter has been constructed with regard to occupant safety and is being used in a way that protects the health of inhabitants. One beneficiary had this to say;

“Yes, the rooms are large, they have bedrooms with their doors, and the house are safe in that it has a ventilator for fresh air, they raised the wall high away from floods and heavy winds they are protected from the bad weather conditions. There is space to cook in the front and at the back of the house but also sometimes when there is rain we cook from inside the house; there is enough ventilation for the smoke to clear from the house.”

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

Since moving into the semi-permanent mud-brick structure, the level of perception of safety has reportedly increased, and the feeling of being unsafe has decreased. On arrival, 93.2% reported feeling unsafe or very unsafe in their shelter. However, since moving into the semi-permanent shelter, the level of perception of feeling unsafe or very unsafe decreased to 3.9%. Over 90% felt that the provided shelter does provide adequate private space to bathe.

Evidence from the qualitative interviews reinforces this perceived feeling of safety. During focus group discussions participants said that the upgrade from the temporary shelter to the semi-permanent shelter made them feel more secure and satisfied. They also stated that the semi-permanent shelter had provided increased protection to beneficiaries from theft. Thieves used to cut plastic sheet on the roof and walls. The semi-permanent shelter is a deterrent, so people feel safer and free to go about their daily business. This was reported by one PSN as;

“Am free from being exposed to thieves, I can lock my door, and I travel up to Koboko [...another district which is approximately 60 kilometers away from Imvepi] and find my house safe. The shelter also prevents cases of gender-based violence compared to the previous one; to some extent, I have my own room free from that of the children.”

Protection of the mud brick structure through plastering or smearing is essential in ensuring its durability and sustainability. A majority reported that CARE Volunteers talked to them about maintaining their shelter and all respondents reported carrying out some form of maintenance on their shelter. This is supported by findings from focus group discussions which show that CARE staff provided the beneficiaries with adequate maintenance information before they moved in. This was alluded to be one respondent thus;

“The houses are being monitored by the care volunteers, and they advise PSNs on how to maintain them. They tell you first to smear the floor and the walls before you move in because it helps to keep the walls strong during the rainy season. They also tell you to check the windows and the doors if they are well-placed stable before you move in.”

Overall, 84.5% of the respondents indicated the provided semi-permanent structure met their expectations / hopes. To confirm their satisfaction with the semi-permanent shelter, respondents were asked whether they had any intention to move from the settlement in the next 3 months and almost all PSNs expressed no intention to leave.

During qualitative interviews, all participants said they were satisfied with the shelter upgrades and that there was an immediate impact. One particular beneficiary noted;

“I am very pleased with what I have, the house has two large rooms, the children sleep in one room, and I sleep with the younger ones in another room. There is even still enough space to keep my things, and also my neighbor sometimes brings her food here for safe keeping.”

“I am very satisfied with the house. It is not as hot as the tent was and it is also secured, when we are not at open, we lock it so it is not like the tent where anyone can walk in any time. This now feels like a real house for me.”

However, only 55.7% agreed that the constructed latrine for persons with disabilities was user-friendly. The qualitative assessment found the provided shelter improved the privacy and security of the refugees with strong lockable windows and doors. One beneficiary confirmed this by saying;

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. **3** Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

“In terms of the shelter I have been protected from issues of heavy rainfall and strong winds. The house also has strong doors and windows, so I bought my padlock that I use especially at night hours and during the day time if in case, I want to travel somewhere.”

Another respondent underscored the change in ventilation and aeration of the new structure. She explained that the semi-permanent shelter reduced the heat inside the shelters and that the new shelter was a lot cooler.

“Now I have fresh air in the house due to the presence of the ventilators that provides. The heat inside has also reduced, this house is much cooler than the tent I used to live in and also when it is hot I just open the window, and I get fresh air.”

“The house is free from wind and floods; the house is well constructed that enables me to stay in comfortably compared to the other shelters such as tarpaulin house. It also has a good roof and strong wall which can stay longer although during the time of rain.”

Conclusions and Recommendation

Evidence from the quantitative and qualitative interviews indicate that the PSN were satisfied with the provided shelter. The semi-permanent shelter improved security, safety, and feeling of comfort. Compared to the arrival experience and situations, the safety and dignity of PSNs have significantly improved, coupled with a reduction in threats and vulnerability to violence.

This shelter programming strategy should be cascaded to other settlement. The findings indicate that this is a very relevant intervention, reinforced by feedback and high positive rating. There is also evidence (among 10% of surveyed refugees) that some PSNs actually worked together and constructed their own semi-permanent shelter. This best practice should be rolled out to other refugee population. The Humanitarian actors could focus on providing material for the semi-permanent structure and encourage the refugees to construct their own. We also recommend a detailed cost analysis be done and information made available to the INGOs for a guide on the valuation of the subsequent intervention.

Livelihood, skills development, and training

Income Generating Activities

According to Table 2, the assessment of incomes source among the youths reveals that 69% have a source of income, though least reported among female youth. Average earnings in the last 30 days was low with 80% of the population reportedly earning less than 50,000/= . The Male youth earned significantly more than females with 29.4% and male youth earning between 50, 0001 – 150,000 compared to 6.9% female youth.

Over 60% of the youth engaged in some form of IGA in the last 12 months. Importantly the majority reported engaging in an IGA of their choice, but more female had received support to start their IGA. The qualitative assessment found that the youth were supported in terms of training provided by NGOs who are providing livelihood support to the refugee community. The organizations that provided the training included CARE,

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

NRC, Caritas, Living Hope Uganda, and Samaritan Purse. This was so because in the ADA project, receiving the grant support for businesses was conditional to having participated in the business skills training conducted by CARE and its partner CREAM; as the quality of training provided by other agencies could not be guaranteed or even validated by CARE or UNHCR. One beneficiary confirmed this by saying;

“Yes, we received livelihood training from organizations such as the Norwegian refugee council, NRC, Caritas, Living Hope, etc. They provided the same kind of training that CARE gave us.”

Evidence from focused group discussions also reveal that the youths received support from CARE International in terms of retail items like rice, soap, sugar, salt, matchbox – as one beneficiary reported:

“Yes, we received plenty of material support from CARE international. It was some sugar, salt, rice, and matchbox; it was useful although they were few; it helped us a lot.”

The major source of income for the interviewed youths is casual labor and petty trade commerce. The female youth preferred tailoring, market vending and hairdressing while the males preferred produce trading, hairdressing / cutting and market vending. Dependency was however high, especially among the female youth – 35.3% of female youth were the only income earners in their households.

The top five IGA in which the respondents were engaged in were reportedly market vending, agricultural produce, hairdressing, livestock keeping, and tailoring. This was supported by findings from focused group discussions with the youth who mentioned other income-generating activities that the youth are engaged in.

“The most common IGA that other youths are getting income from are bricklaying, quarrying and participating in the shelter constructions in the settlement. I have seen youths laying bricks at the end they sell to the constructors to construct latrines, PSN shelter and youths involve themselves in hard labor such as lifting bricks and mortar.”

About 58% reported receiving cash grants and an increase in asset was also reported by over 80% of the interviewed youth.

Table 3: Income, IGA and Grant / Voucher

Income, IGA and Grant / Voucher	Male Youth		Female Youth	
	N	N(%)	N	N(%)
Has source of income ⁶	31	19 (61.3)	102	61 (59.8)
Average earning (in UGX) in the last month (past 30 days) prior to interview	17		58	
≤ 50,000		12 (70.6)		54 (93.1)
50,001 - 150,000		5 (29.4)		4 (6.9)
Engaged in an IGA in the past one year prior to Survey	31	19 (61.3)	102	63 (67.7)

² Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. ³ Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

⁴ Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

⁵ This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

⁶ Question refers to the current source of income.

⁷ Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Currently Engaged in an IGA of choice	19	18 (94.7)	63	59 (93.7)
Been supported to start or improve IGA	31	17 (54.8)	102	58 (61.8)
Respondent lives in a household with no other income earner ⁷	31	14 (45.2)	102	36 (35.3)
Received a cash grant/ voucher over the last six months	31	18 (58.1)	102	60 (58.8)
Reports increase in asset and income after initiating business	19	16 (84.2)	63	49 (77.8)

Training in Livelihoods and Business Skills

All the interviewed youths received training on livelihood and reported they were trained by CARE international. According to qualitative results, some of the livelihood activities that the youths were trained on included hairdressing, building houses and animal rearing such as goats, cow, and carpentry (like making chairs, tables) and motor vehicle repair. Majority of youth were trained on the livelihood they are currently engaged in. Training in various business models was generally well reported among the youth, but access to vocational training was low. Whereas the project design provided for vocational skills training to 540, it was not possible to train all the youths because at the end of the business skills training only 223 expressed the need for technical vocational skills training and as such, only 223 youths; (refugee 107 females ,51 males and host community 47 females and 18 males) were trained on vocational skills at the job Centre for a period of one month.

Table 4: Training in Livelihoods and Business Skills

Training in Livelihood and business skills	Male Youth		Female Youth	
	N	N%	N	N%
Trained by CARE International in Uganda	31	31 (100)	102	100 (98)
Received any training on livelihood	31	30 (96.8)	102	100 (98)
Trained in the livelihood activity currently involved in	31	22 (71)	102	74 (72.5)
Had any vocational training	31	11 (35.5)	102	39 (38.2)
Trained in Business identification	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained in Business selection	31	31 (100)	102	101 (99)
Trained in Business management	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Training in Making business plans	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained in Customer care	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained in Records keeping	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on how to save money	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on an understanding of the Business environment	31	31 (100)	102	101 (99)
Trained on Decision making	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on self-management	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on peer to peer	31	31 (100)	102	101 (99)
Trained on conflict management	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on Team building	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)
Trained on gender relations	31	31 (100)	102	102 (100)

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

Evidence from a focus group discussion with the youth reveals several challenges that face the youth in running their livelihood enterprises. The youth cited lack of market and the high cost of doing business in the settlements as some participants noted;

“For me with the type of the business that I have for example selling eggs, it become difficult for me to sell all the stock making the remaining eggs to get spoiled at the end and also transport – like in terms of going back to get some more stock, it needs travelling like up to Arua, or even to Koboko district to pick more items.”

“Things are expensive to purchase here in the settlement when it comes to stocking them it will force you to travel up to either Koboko or Arua.”

“About the goat rearing, it is a very good business, but the challenges come when they are infected with diseases and pests, we are unable to get enough pesticide. When the little we are given gets done, it becomes a challenge because it will require enough money to transport one to Arua town and purchase them.”

“In the retail business, there is high competition among the retailers which calls for the consistent supply of goods in order for one to out-compete in the market.”

“As a motor repairer, I received a toolbox, but there were like five spanners in it, so becomes hard to do my work since I lack most of the spanners. Such spanners are very expensive in the settlement hence forcing one to go to either Koboko or Arua town.”

Conclusions and Recommendation

Livelihood support to the youths increased the income among the intended beneficiaries and the business training improved the skills and was well reported. The vocational training program didn't, however, have a major reach to the youth. The high dependency at household level suggests that the household income growth strategy should aim at using models that attract other household members also to participate in the household economic development. The study finds access to cash grants at less than 60% and the youth still report high cost of doing business and lack of effective and ready market as major challenges in building their enterprises.

There is a need to strengthen vocational training component, especially for the male youth. Linking the trained youth to financial services for start-up loans would also expedite the development and expansion of their business.

Sexual exploitation, abuse, and gender-based violence

Harmful behavior and violence against women

The most common harmful behavior and violence that exist in the community against women were physical violence, domestic violence and threats of violence, drugs and alcohol abuse, early marriage, economic violence, and emotional/psychological violence.

² Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. ³ Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

⁴ Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

⁵ This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

⁶ Question refers to the current source of income.

⁷ Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Reduction of harmful behavior was pronounced for ‘threats of violence and coercion,’ ‘physical violence,’ ‘emotional violence,’ denial of resources or access to services’ and ‘economic violence.’ Men and women had a strong opinion on the reduction of these violence forms, seemingly because they are the major perpetrators or victims of such forms of violence.

Table 5: Perceptions of reduction in harmful behavior and violence against women

Harmful behaviors and Violence against women	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
N	60	51	31	102	60
Threats of violence and coercion Reduced	47 (78.3)	11 (21.6)	2 (6.5)	4 (3.9)	5 (8.3)
Physical violence Reduced	49 (81.7)	34 (66.7)	5 (16.1)	16 (15.7)	18 (30)
Emotional/Psychological abuse Reduced	39 (65)	14 (27.5)	2 (6.5)	5 (4.9)	5 (8.3)
Denial of resources or access to services Reduced	12 (20)	3 (5.9)	1 (3.2)	3 (2.9)	6 (10)
Economic violence Reduced	39 (65)	10 (19.6)	2 (6.5)	4 (3.9)	6 (10)
Transactional sex(Prostitution/survivals) Reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	0 (0)	2 (2)	4 (6.7)
Sexual violence Reduced	4 (6.7)	4 (7.8)	1 (3.2)	1 (1)	5 (8.3)
Sexual abuse by someone known Increased	1 (1.7)	2 (3.9)	5 (16.1)	8 (7.8)	8 (13.3)
Rape Reduced	2 (3.3)	5 (9.8)	2 (6.5)	2 (2)	11 (18.3)
Sexual exploitation by people in positions of power Reduced	1 (1.7)	2 (3.9)	6 (19.4)	9 (8.8)	9 (15)
Sexual harassment Reduced	2 (3.3)	2 (3.9)	5 (16.1)	9 (8.8)	9 (15)
Domestic violence Reduced	24 (40)	23 (45.1)	5 (16.1)	11 (10.8)	17 (28.3)
People trafficking Reduced	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)	4 (6.7)
Early marriage Reduced	23 (38.3)	20 (39.2)	5 (16.1)	6 (5.9)	5 (8.3)
Forced marriage Reduced	5 (8.3)	6 (11.8)	3 (9.7)	4 (3.9)	18 (30)
Harmful cultural practices Reduced	3 (5)	1 (2)	4 (12.9)	8 (7.8)	8 (13.3)
Forced recruitment into armed groups Increased	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	2 (6.5)	2 (2)	5 (8.3)
Alcohol and drugs Reduced	37 (61.7)	27 (52.9)	3 (9.7)	9 (8.8)	14 (23.3)
Female Genital Mutilation Reduced	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)	2 (3.3)

Table 6: Places of harmful behavior and Violence against women

Places of violence against women	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Collecting fire wood	50 (54.9)	25 (30.1)	10 (47.6)	27 (61.4)	2(1.6)
At home	4 (4.4)	12 (14.5)	1 (4.8)	2 (4.5)	34(27.9)
On the road	0 (0)	3 (3.6)	2 (9.5)	1 (2.3)	16(13.1)
Food distribution points	10 (10.9)	3 (3.6)	1 (4.8)	1 (2.3)	13(10.7)
Trading centers	5 (5.5)	17 (20.5)	4 (19.0)	8 (18.2)	13(10.7)

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

Water points	5 (5.5)	1 (1.2)	2 (9.5)	3 (6.8)	5(4.1)
Markets	3 (3.3)	8 (9.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20(16.4)
Others	14 (15.4)	14 (16.9)	1 (4.8)	2 (4.5)	19(15.6)
Total	91 (100)	83 (100)	21 (100)	44 (100)	122(100)

Respondents, observed a reduction in harmful behavior and violence against women in identified places compared to the time they first came to the settlement.

Table 7: Reduction in Violence against women at various places

	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
Collecting fire wood Reduced	47 (78.3)	22 (43.1)	6 (19.4)	14 (13.7)	3 (5)
Water points Reduced	5 (8.3)	2 (3.9)	1 (3.2)	0 (0)	6 (10)
Latrine reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Market places Reduced	3 (5)	9 (17.6)	1 (3.2)	13 (12.7)	26 (43.3)
Trading areas/centers Reduced	5 (8.3)	12 (23.5)	1 (3.2)	1 (1)	7 (11.7)
Food distribution points Reduced	10 (16.7)	5 (9.8)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)	11 (18.3)
Verification points Reduced	2 (3.3)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	4 (3.9)	4 (6.7)
At home Reduced	4 (6.7)	12 (23.5)	1 (3.2)	20 (19.6)	37 (61.7)
On the roads Reduced	3 (5)	11 (21.6)	14 (45.2)	14 (13.7)	0 (0)
At/near roads Reduced	5 (8.3)	0 (0)	1 (3.2)	6 (5.9)	6 (10)

Harmful Behavior and Violence Against Men

The most commonly reported harmful behavior and violence against men that exist in the community were physical violence, drug, and alcohol abuse, domestic violence, early marriage, economic violence, emotional violence and threats of violence and coercion. Compared to the time the refugees arrived at the settlement, harmful behavior and violence against men have reportedly reduced.

Table 8: Reduction in harmful behaviors and violence against men

	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth
N	60	51	31	102
Threats of violence and coercion reduced	45 (75)	9 (17.6)	1 (3.2)	3 (2.9)
Physical violence reduced	33 (55)	19 (37.3)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)
Emotional/Psychological abuse reduced	31 (51.7)	10 (19.6)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)
Denial of resources or access to services reduced	2 (3.3)	1 (2)	3 (9.7)	3 (2.9)
Economic violence reduced	38 (63.3)	11 (21.6)	0 (0)	2 (2)
Transactional sex reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	(0)

² Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. ³ Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

⁴ Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

⁵ This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

⁶ Question refers to the current source of income.

⁷ Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Sexual abuse by someone known reduced	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.2)	1 (1)
Rape reduced	1 (1.7)	2 (3.9)	3 (9.7)	3 (2.9)
Sexual exploitation by people in positions of power reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	(0)
Sexual harassment reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	3 (9.7)	5 (4.9)
Domestic violence reduced	10 (16.7)	10 (19.6)	1 (3.2)	2 (2)

According to the table below, respondents identified the riskiest places for harmful behavior and violence against men was firewood places, the trading center, at home and on the road. In this context, firewood does not only refer to wood for making fire. Firewood is used to refer to wood collected for any other purpose such as for building poles and charcoal burning among others.

Table 9: Places where men face the risk of violence

Places of violence against men	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Collecting fire wood	13(7.9)	8(21.6)	50(67.6)	1(1.5)	15(21.7)
At home	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(9.5)	6(9.1)	16(23.2)
On the road	1(0.6)	0(0.0)	1(1.4)	2(3.0)	3(4.3)
Trading centers	2(1.2)	2(4.3)	8(10.8)	8(12.1)	15(21.7)
Others	149(90.3)	37(78.7)	8(10.8)	49(74.2)	20(29.0)
Total	165(100)	47(100)	74(100)	66(100)	69(100)

Respondents reported reduction in various forms of violence but the perceived reduction varied by age cohorts and gender. The men and male youth, for instance, report that violence among them in the firewood collection places reduced while the women and female youth report more violence reduction at home.

Table 10: Reduction in violence against men at various places

	Men	Women (1549) years	Male Youth	Female Youth
N	60	51	31	102
Collecting fire food reduced	47 (78.3)	13 (25.5)	5 (16.1)	1 (1)
Water points reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	(0)
Latrine reduced	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.2)	1 (1)
Marketing places reduced	2 (3.3)	9 (17.6)	2 (6.5)	13 (12.7)
Trading areas/Centre reduced	6 (10)	14 (27.5)	3 (9.7)	23 (22.5)
Food distribution points reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	(0)
At home reduced	6 (10)	15 (29.4)	3 (9.7)	24 (23.5)

1 Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

On the roads reduced	1 (1.7)	3 (5.9)	0 (0)	4 (3.9)
At/near roads reduced	1 (1.7)	1 (2)	1 (3.2)	(0)

The justification for Violence against women

Violence is undesired and presents enormous challenges to the affected individuals, their families, clans and the entire community. Violence has however socially become normalized and thus accommodated as a way of life. Due to the patriarchal nature of society, violence (especially against women) is even at times justified by both men and women. Results in Table 11 below show a significant reduction in justification for the use of violence against women across all population groups. The strongest rejection of justification for violence against women was observed among men which suggests the effectiveness of the role men model approach towards violence prevention.

In table 11, we also observe acceptance of violent behaviors on the intimate partner as seen in female youth where the proportion rejecting violence decreased during this end line evaluation. Two sample test of proportions for baseline-end line change was conducted on the violence parameter in all the respondent groups. While we found positive improvements in the all respondent groups and parameters, the female youth still accepted violence use and was significant on a situation when a woman burns food.

Table 11: Justification for Intimate Partner Violence

Rejection of IPV use	Men		Women		Male Youth		Female Youth		PSNs			
	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline		Endline	
									male	Female	Male	Female
Sample size	190	60	190	51	190	31	190	102	62	172	16	44
If she goes out without telling him?	54.7	98.3	66.3	78.4	60.5	80.7	65.3	77.5	45.2	52.3	93.8	93.2
If she neglects the children ?	52.1	93.3	60.5	74.5	60	80.7	63.7	65.7	50.0	55.8	93.8	90.9
If she argues	62.1	96.7	66.8	80.4	66.3	77.4	68.9	58.8	50.0	58.7	93.8	93.2

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. 3 Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

with him?													
If she burns the food?	77.9	98.3	76.8	76.5	71.1	77.4	78.9	64.7	62.9	64	100	95.5	

While this is an unintended program outcome, cross-cultural ethnographic research and evaluations in some sub-Saharan African societies has shown that women sometimes justify intimate partner violence more often than men do. Patriarchal gender norms, including a tolerance for violence against women, in which the woman is subjugated by the man and confined to domestic responsibilities and actions contrary to these expectations, justifies violence against the woman and is considered probable explanation for the persistence of IPV (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006; Uthman et al., 2009). In South Sudanese population context, a study by Scot et al., (2013) found an overwhelming acceptance of intimate partner violence against women by women, even when age and years of education was controlled for. Many women agreed that there are times when a woman deserves to be beaten and that a woman should tolerate violence in order to keep her family together.

A longitudinal study by Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International (2011) of GBV customary court cases in South Sudan cited many court proceedings in which wife beating was considered acceptable if there was a justification. The community and the customary courts also prioritize preservation of the marriage and the family unit, often to the detriment of women, and thus women are encouraged to tolerate violence within the family. Social and institutional condoning of male dominance creates a situation where the husband's use of intimate partner violence is the acceptable behavior.

Gender Equitable Attitude

Spousal support through sharing roles and responsibilities is a key measure of gender responsiveness in a family. This, however, is greatly affected by cultural norms, perception, and stereotypes. Overall, there has been a change in perception regarding the roles of men in families with less than 10% of men and male youth thinking a man who shares housework with his wife will eventually be overpowered by the wife. Majority of respondents (74.4%) also agreed that a man could cook dinner for his family, a significant increase of 10% from baseline and the agreement was strongest among men and male youths at over 85%. There was also a significant drop in perception that men do not know how to take care of toddlers without women from 69.2% at baseline to 32% at end line, particularly among females.

Table 12: Gender Equitable attitude

	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
	60	51	31	102	60
A man who shares housework with his wife	6 (10)	10 (19.6)	1 (3.2)	27 (26.5)	7 (11.7)
A man can cook dinner for his family)	49 (81.7)	36 (70.6)	28 (90.3)	77 (75.5)	31 (51.7)
It is shameful to be found by friends a	8 (13.3)	23 (45.1)	7 (22.6)	38 (37.3)	10 (16.7)
Men do not know how to take care of a t	8 (13.3)	29 (56.9)	7 (22.6)	36 (35.3)	32 (53.3)

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

Men who are seen playing, dancing, sing	6 (10)	11 (21.6)	4 (12.9)	20 (19.6)	6 (10)
I can determine the choice of business	3 (5)	26 (51)	28 (90.3)	98 (96.1)	17 (28.3)
I can do my domestic chores at my own time	19 (31.7)	43 (84.3)	30 (96.8)	10 (9.8)	41 (68.3)
I can decide whom to marry and when	57 (95)	47 (92.2)	30 (96.8)	10 (9.8)	48 (80)

Negative Coping Mechanism

How refugees cope with contextual stressful environments in the settlement is crucial to their overall wellbeing and mental health. While many times refugee populations have been reported to indulge in negative, harmful coping strategies for managing their challenges, according to the table below, respondents overwhelmingly rejected the use of all the harmful coping strategies that were measured. At baseline, 24.1% of the refugees found solace in alcohol consumption, 10.7% in drug consumption and 10.3% in fighting in order to forget problems in their lives. Significantly, 40.5% of men, 11.1% of female youth, 24.2% of male youth, 20% of women and 29.1% of engaged in alcohol consumption at baseline. At the end line, these figures had fallen across all population groups. Perhaps the biggest achievement was among men, women and female youth where less than 2% now take alcohol as a coping strategy compared to 40.5% at baseline. Rejection of harmful coping mechanisms has been lowest among male youth and PSNs when compared to the other population groups where on average over 10% still find solace in alcohol or other harmful forms of coping strategies. This could be explained by the unique vulnerabilities of the two groups within the settlements with the youth facing challenges of limited opportunities and a feeling of helplessness among PSNs. Nevertheless, there is a need to develop alternative strategies to mitigate these challenges among the two population groups.

Table 14: Coping mechanism

	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth	PSNs
	60	51	31	102	60
Rejects Taking alcohol to forget problems	59 (98.3)	49 (96.1)	28 (90.3)	98 (96.1)	50 (83.3)
Rejects getting involved in Sex for money	60 (100)	51 (100)	31 (100)	101 (99)	59 (98.3)
Rejects getting involved in extra-marital affairs	60 (100)	51 (100)	30 (96.8)	100 (98)	57 (95)
Rejects getting involved in Theft / robbery	60 (100)	51 (100)	29 (93.5)	99 (97.1)	57 (95)
Rejects getting involved in domestic violence	60 (100)	51 (100)	29 (93.5)	98 (96.1)	56 (93.3)
Rejects getting involved in drug consumption	60 (100)	50 (98)	28 (90.3)	98 (96.1)	56 (93.3)
Rejects getting involved in fighting	59 (98.3)	51 (100)	29 (93.5)	102 (100)	56 (93.3)

2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. 3 Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions

4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter

5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter

6 Question refers to the current source of income.

7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent

Conclusions and Recommendation

The evaluation found out that there is a general reduction in most forms of violence. Violence and harmful behaviors specific to locations have also reduced, suggesting that appropriate targeting has been used. In a situation where violence is existent, physical violence is the most reported form. There was a reduction in justification for the use of violence on intimate partner and more so among men. However, among female youth, we did not measure any significant change on acceptance of violence used against an intimate partner, which, considering that this project was primarily a livelihood intervention with some GBV prevention integrated rather than a focused GBV intervention, is normal given the project's time frame. Improvement in the gender equitable attitude was stronger than changes in attitude rejecting the use of violence on an intimate partner. This finding points that in the refugee's population, changing of gender transformative social norms may take faster pace than violence prevention since most of the refugee population is coming from areas with endemic violence.

Violence prevention campaign should continue to target men to catalyze and speed-up achievements. More sensitization is needed among women and female youth to raise awareness on rights to live a life free from violence.

References

Fulu, E., Kerr-Wilson, A., & Lang, J. (2014). *Effectiveness of interventions to prevent violence against women and girls: a Summary of the Evidence*.

Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HAFM, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts C. *Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence*. Lancet. 2006;368:1260–1269. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International Briefing Paper. *South Sudan: A Human Rights Agenda*; 2011. Accessed on 3-10-2013 <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/06/30/south-sudan-human-rights-agenda>. [Google Scholar]

¹ Of the Refugee household surveyed, 54.3% (165/304) were male headed.

- Namya, S., Heilman, B., Stich, S., Crownover, J., Leka, B., & Edmeades, J. (2015). *Changing what it means to 'become a man': participants' reflections on a school-based programme to redefine masculinity in the Balkans*. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(S2, S206–S222).
- Pulerwitz, J., & Barker, G. (2008). *Measuring Attitudes toward Gender Norms among Young Men in Brazil: Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the GEM Scale*. *Men and Masculinities*. Retrieved from <http://jmm.sagepub.com>.
- Scott J, Averbach S, Modest AM, Hacker MR, Cornish S, Spencer D, Murphy M, Parmar P. (2013). *An assessment of gender inequitable norms and gender-based violence in South Sudan: a community-based participatory research approach*. *Confl Health*. 2013 Mar 6;7(1):4. doi: 10.1186/1752-1505-7-4.
- Soul City Institute for Social Justice. (2008). Retrieved 09 17, 2017, from <http://www.soulcity.org.za>.

- 2 Some PSNs may not have any form of disability. PSN includes elderly, pregnant women, unaccompanied minors and other form of vulnerability determined by the refugee agency. 3 Eight (8) PSNs did not respond to this questions
- 4 Three (3) PSN were not living in a Semi-Permanent Shelter
- 5 This question was asked to PSN who are beneficiary of Semi-permanent shelter
- 6 Question refers to the current source of income.
- 7 Question refers to another household member other than the respondent



care®



CARE International in Uganda

P.O. Box 7280, 2nd Floor, Kalamu House. Plot 1B Kira Road, Kampala, Uganda. **Tel:** +256 312 258 100 **Web:** www.careuganda.org

CARE is an Equal Opportunity Employer and Affirmative Action Employer (AA/M/F/D/V) dedicated to workplace diversity. CARE® and CARE Package® are registered marks of CARE. Copyright ©2008 by Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE). All rights reserved. Unless otherwise indicated, all photos ©CARE.