POVERTY AND WETLAND DEGRADATION: A CASE STUDY OF BISINA WETLAND COMPLEX IN KAPIR SUB COUNTY, NGORA DISTRICT

BY
OGUGU PATRICK
BU/UG/2010/454



A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF NATURAL
RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACHELOR'S
DEGREE OF SCIENCE IN NATURAL RESOURCE
ECONOMICS OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

JUNE 2014

DECLARATION

I Ogugu Patrick hereby declare that this report is my original work. It has never been submitted to any university or any higher institution of learning for any academic award. Thus, I accept to be responsible for everything contained in it.

| Sign | | | | | |
|------|-------|------|----|------|--|
| | Of | ing. | | | |
| OGUC | GU PA | TRIC | K | | |
| Date | 26 | 106 | 14 | | |

APPROVAL

This is to certify that the work entitled "poverty and environmental(wetland)degradation" has been done under my supervision and is now ready for submission to the faculty of Natural resource and environmental science.

Signature

Mr. Taako Edema George

Supervisor

Date. 22/10/2014-

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family and friends especially my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Emukuwho have sacrificed everything to ensure my academic success, Thank you for giving me such a moral foundation on which I have managed to come this far. It is my prayer that the good Lord rewards you abundantly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank God for enabling me to reach this far in my academic struggles. My indebtedness goes to my family for their unfailing support mentally, financially and morally. I am so thankful to both my parents, Mr. and Mrs Emuku for my childhood upbringing, inspiration, moral support, financial support and my education.

I am also grateful to my supervisor MrTaako Edema for his patience and guidance that have helped me complete this research.

I would also like to extend my deep gratitude to the staff of Busitema university Namasagali campus whose moral, friendly and academic support has enabled me to accomplish this work. Thank you much for your encouragement, guidance and supervision.

I also express my sincere gratitude to all my friends especially the pioneers and everyone who has provided academic and friendly support during the hard times.

GOD BLESS YOU VERY MUCH.

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 4. 1 Background Information of the Respondents | .17 |
|--|-----|
| Table 4. 2 determinants of (environmental) wetland degradation | .20 |
| Table 4. 3 The poverty-environmental degradation linkage in the sub county | |
| Table 4. 4 steps taken to reduce environmental degradation in Sub County | .24 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRYONMS

NEMA National Environment Management Authority

EIA Environmental Impact Assessment

WCED World Commission on Environmental and Development

UNEP United Nations Environment Programme

WB World Bank

UPE Universal Primary Education

USE UniversalSecondaryEducation

ABSTRACT

The relationship between poverty and environmental degradation has been on the global agenda for a long time. This attracted research to be done in NgoraDistrict to establish the nexus since Uganda is a developing country susceptible to the degradation like any other country as shown by the literature review of poverty.

The research was carried out in Sub County using the structured questionnaires that were distributed to the respondents to fill in and latter collected by the researcher. Both the qualitative and quantitative methods were employed in the course of gathering the data with some focus group discussions conducted to meet the objectives of the research. The research used purposive sampling to avoid the element of time wasting keep focused on the respondents in the Bisina wetland vicinity. Quality control checks were carried out tomake sure that data met the objectives of the research by carefully entering the data in the excel sheets with the special care on the coding of the data in its raw form.

The data analysis was done and the findings summarized into the tables that were easier to interpret 67.2% of the respondents were male, 32.8% were female. 48.3% were married 29(50%) agreed that poverty has accelerated the rate of environmental degradation which was the majority, 36(62.1%) agreed that Wetland degradation has been brought about by population growth, 29(50%) agreed that due to clearance of wetland vegetation for agriculture leading to the degradation 41(70.7%) agreed that wetlands have been destroyed by mining activities. 31(53.4%) disagreed meaning that they cannot afford the basic necessities of life eg food shelter education health .17(29.3%) disagreed meaning that cannot afford to spend more than 2500 aday hence living below the poverty line depending directly on the environment for survival.

The research found out that the poverty influences environment degradation in the sub county thoug there were other causes of the degradation like population growth, urbanization the recommendations were government needed to enforce laws to protect nature and also investing in the education of the respondents to reduce illiteracy through UPE and USE. The better solution which can rescue both the environment and poor people is through the government by increasing the rate of job creation for poor people. If they have jobs they can afford higher quality life which includes affording electricity, they can also afford nice roofing materials

instead of using grasses and they can have somewhere to wake up to instead of harvesting the natural resources everyday.

Table of Contents

| DECLARATIONi |
|---|
| APPROVALii |
| DEDICATIONiii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTiv |
| LIST OF TABLESv |
| LIST OFABBREVIATIONS/ACRYONMSvi |
| ABSTRACTvii |
| Table of Contentsix |
| INTRODUCTION1 |
| 1.0 Introduction |
| 1.1 Background of the Study |
| 1,2 Problem Statement |
| 1.3 The Purpose of Conducting the Study |
| 1.4.1 Main objective |
| 1.4.2 Specific objectives |
| 1.4.3 Research questions 5 |
| 1.5 Scope of the Study |
| 1.6 Significance of the Study5 |
| 1.7 Justification |
| 1.8 Conceptual framework: |
| 1.9 Chapter summary |
| LITERATURE REVIEW8 |
| 2.0 Introduction |
| 2.1 Definition of terms and concepts |
| 2.1.1 Poverty |
| 2.1.2 A wetland |
| 2.1.3 Degradation |
| 2.2 Linkages between Poverty and Environmental Degradation9 |
| 2.3 Poverty and environmental nexus9 |
| METHODOLOGY |

| 3.1 | Intr | oduction | 11 |
|------|------|---|------|
| 3.2 | Res | earch design | 11 |
| 3.3 | Poj | pulation | 11 |
| 3.3 | .1 | Sample and sampling technique | 12 |
| 3.4 | Res | earch instrument | 12 |
| 3.5 | Stu | dy Area | 12 |
| 3.6 | Me | thods of Data collection | 12 |
| 3.7 | Too | ols t used in research. | 13 |
| 3.7 | .1 | The interview guide | 13 |
| 3.7 | .2 | Questionnaires | 13 |
| 3.7 | .3 | Secondary data | 13 |
| 3.8 | Res | earch Formalities | 14 |
| 3.9 | Pro | cedure for Data Collection | 14 |
| 3.10 | Dat | a Analysis and interpretation | 14 |
| 3.1 | 0.1 | Dissemination of the results | .,15 |
| 3.1 | 0.2 | Ethical consideration | 15 |
| 3.1 | 0.3 | Conclusion | 15 |
| 3.1 | 0.4 | Constraints | 16 |
| 3.11 | Cha | pter summary | 16 |
| DATA | ÂNA | LYSIS AND PRISENTATION OF FINDINGS | 17 |
| 4. i | Intr | oduction | 17 |
| 4.2 | Pres | sentation of findings | 17 |
| 4.2 | .1 | Background information of the respondents | 17 |
| 4.2 | .2 | Gender of Respondents. | 19 |
| 4.2 | .3 | Age of the respondents | 19 |
| SUMM | ARY | OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 26 |
| .5,1 | İntr | oduction | 26 |
| 5.2 | Fine | dings of the research | 26 |
| 5.2 | .1 | Gender of respondents | 26 |
| 5.2 | .2 | Age of the respondents | Ž7 |
| 5,2 | .3 | Marital status of the respondent | 27 |

| 5,2 | 2.4 Level of education of respondents | 28 |
|---------|---|----|
| 5.2 | 2.5 Employment status of respondents | 28 |
| 5.2 | 2.6 Duration spent in the study area by respondents | 29 |
| 5.3 | Overall summary | 30 |
| 5.4 | Conclusion | 30 |
| 5.5 | General recommendation | 31 |
| 5.6 | Further research | 31 |
| Referer | ıces | 32 |
| Append | lices | 35 |
| Appe | endix 1: Questionnaire | 35 |
| Appe | endix 2 Activity time schedule | 39 |
| Budg | get estimates | 40 |

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The relation between poverty levels and environmental degradation has been widely debated inside academic circles. The theoretical linkage between poverty and environmental degradation has for some time been shroud in ambiguity. Environment degradation and poverty are closely interrelated and inseparable, particularly in developing countries. Awareness and concern about environmental degradation have grown around the world over the last few decades; these concerns are shared by people of different nations, cultures, religions and social classes. In recent years economic researchers have become increasingly aware of the important implications that the state of the environment has for the success of development effort. (Michael P Todaro, Stephen C Smith, Economic Development)

to a self-perpetuating process in which as a result of ignorance or economic necessity, communities may in advertently destroy or exhaust the resources on which they depend for survival. (Michael P Todaro, Stephen C Smith, Economic Development) making the research a necessity.

1.1 Background of the Study

Uganda has a growing population estimated at about 33 million people today. Agriculture remains the mainstay of the economy, though the industrial sector is undergoing transformation. The country has an area of about 587, 900 km2 of which 576,000 km2 is land surface. Eighty-eightpercent of the land surface is classified as arid and semi-arid lands and the remaining 12% forms the medium and high agricultural potential land. This classification is based mainly on the moisture index as indicated by average annual rainfall and evapo-transpiration. The stated classifications of agricultural land potential in the country have implications for development aimed at meeting increasing human needs. Increasing population is associated with need for more food, land and provision of social amenities in urban areas and demand for energy. These demands lead to over-utilisation and cultivation of ecologically sensitive areas, over-abstraction of water and over exploitation of vegetation and forests. Consequently the environment gets

References

- 1. Dietz, T., Unknown, A., Adana, W. R. and Zeal, F. (2001). Pastoral Commercialization: OnCaloric Terms of Trade and Related Issues, in M.A. Mohamed Salish, Ton Dietz and A. G.M. Ached (ends). African Pastoralists: Conflicts, Institutions and Government, London:
- 2.Emerson, L. and Bessemer, Y. (2000). Economic Constraints to the Management of marine protected areas: The Case of Kristie Marine National Park and Mpunguti MarineNational Reserve, Kenya. IUCN The World Conservation Union, Eastern AfricaRegional Office, Nairobi.
- 3. Government of Kenya (GoK)(2003). Kenya: Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and employment Creation, 2003-2007. Government Printer, Nairobi...
- 4. Government of Kenya (GoK)(2004). National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Arid and Semi-arid Lands of Kenya. Draft-December 2004
- 5. Health, B. (??). Agriculture in Rangelands: A case study from the Laikipia District inCentral Kenya. Economics section: International Union for the Conservation of Nature.
- 6. Hussein, N. M. (2004). Monitoring Report of firewood and refugee impacts on the environment around Dadaab, Wajir District.
- 7. Indoor Air Pollution (2000). Fighting a Massive Health Threat in India, World Bank, Washington DC, 2000.
- 8. Kebaya, E. O. (2000). Water supply and sanitation challenges and responses in KisumuTown.M.Phil thesis, School of Environmental Studies, Moi University, Eldoret.
- 9. Kenya, Republic of. (2005). State of Environment Report 2004. NEMA.
- 10. Kenya Wildlife Service and the Forest Department (1991). Memorandum of Understanding for the Joint Management of Selected Forests. Unpublished report.
- 12. Kiragu, S. W. (2002). Community participation in forest resources management in Mt.Elgon Forest and its environs.M.Phil thesis, School of Environmental Studies, MoiUniversity, Eldoret.
- 13. Matiru, V. (2000). Forest Cover and Forest Reserves in Kenya: Policy and Practice.IUCN Forest and Social Perspectives in Conservation.
- 14. Ministry of Energy. 2002. Study on Kenya's Energy Demand, Supply and Policy Strategyfor Households, Small Scale Industries and Service Establishments: Final Report Nairobi, KAMFOR Company Limited: 158 pp.

- 15. Mwanjala, J. (2005). An Overview of Wildlife and Tourism Management in Kenya Paper Presented to the 3rd II PT African Conference on Peace through Tourism, Lusaka Zambia, 6th–11th February, 2005.
- 16. Mugabe, J. O. (1994). Technological Capability for Environmental Management. The case of biodiversity conservation in Kenya. Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- 17. Ndeng'e, G., Opiyo, C., Mistiaen, J. and Kristjanson, P. (2003). Geographic Dimensionof Poverty in Kenya. Where are the Poor? From Districts to Locations. Volume II. RegalPress Kenya Ltd, Nairobi.
- 18. Njuguna, M. (2005). Local aloe joins in global trade. Daily Nations's Horizon featurearticle, Thursday, January 20, 2005.
- 19. Nyang, F. O. (1999). Household Energy Demand and Environmental Management in Kenya. Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- 20. Odada, E.O., D.O. Olago, K. Kulindwa, M. Ntiba and S. Wandiga (2004). Mitigation of Environmental Problems, in Lake Victoria, East Africa: Causal Chain and PolicyAnalyses. Ambio 33(1-2): 13-19.
- 21. Okedi, J., Ogutu, Z. A. and OkeyoOwuor (2005). Wetlans Research in the lake VictoriaBasin: Analysis and synthesis I. Lake Victoria Research Initiative. SIDA/SAREC interUniversity Council for East Africa.
- 22. Pkalya, R., Adan, M. and Masinde, I. (2003). Conflicts in Northern Kenya.A focus on theinternally displaced conflict victims in Northern Kenya.ITDG-Nairobi.
- 23. Smith, K. (1999). Pollution Management in Focus, The World Bank, Washington, DC, 1999.
- 24. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)(1999). Capacity Building forIntegrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting Training Manual. UNEP, Nairobi.
- 25. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)(1992). The Benefits of Diversity: AnIncentive toward Sustainable Agriculture. UNDP, New York.
- 26. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)(1995). VulnerabilityAssessment, February 1995.
- 27. World Resources 1998-99: Environmental Change and Human Health, WRI, UNDP, UNEP & World Bank, Washington DC, 1998.

- 28 Dasgupta, Partha, and Karl-GöranMäler 1995. "Poverty, Institutions, and the Environmental esource Base." In Handbook of Development Economics, vol. III, edited by J. B. a. T. N. Srinivasan. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 29 Ghimire, Krishna B. 1994. "Parks and People: Livelihood Issues in National Parks Management in Thailand and Madagascar." In Development and Environment: Sustaining People and Nature, edited by D. Ghai, Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers (for UNRISD).
- 30 Lele, Sharachchandra M. 1991. "Sustainable Development: A Critical Review." World Development 19 (6): 607-621.
- 31 Lopez, Ramon 1992. "Environmental Degradation and Economic Openness in LDCs: The Poverty Linkage." American Journal of Agricultural Economics 74 (5): 1138-43.
- 32. Ostrom, Elinor 1990. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 33. Reardon, Thomas, and Stephen A. Vosti 1995. "Links Between Rural Poverty and the Environment in Developing Countries: Asset Categories and Investment Poverty." World Development
- 34. Sen, A. 1981. Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Clarion Press.