

Reintegration and Resettlement Experiences of Former Karimojong Child Migrants

Karol Czuba

October 2012



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Acknowledgements

Research for this report would not have been possible without the work of Lokiru Denis Pius, who conducted interviews and focus group discussions. The author would like to express his gratitude to Dr Christopher Lee for his assistance with project design. Kutesa Seth provided logistical support and Elenyu Eric and Komakech David drove the team to research sites.

Note on Language

For reasons of practicality, this report accepts the legal definition of a child as a person below the age of eighteen. The term “child” as used in the report, therefore, applies both to young children and adolescents. The Karimojong distinguish between the two categories and refer to children below the age of twelve or so as *ɲidwe* (singular: *ekoko*); adolescent boys are called *ɲikaracuna* (singular: *ekaracunait*) and girls – *ɲapesur* (singular: *apese*).

Glossary

<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>	<u>English</u>
<i>Apese</i>	<i>ɲapesur</i>	girl
<i>Awi</i>	<i>ɲawuyoi</i>	kraal
<i>Ebokorait/Abokorait</i>	<i>Dibokora/Dabokora</i>	a male/female member of the <i>Dibokora</i> (Bokora) section of the Karimojong which primarily inhabits Napak District
<i>Edosoit/Adosoit</i>	<i>Didoso/Dadoso</i>	a male/female member of the Karamojong ethnic group (<i>Didoso</i> or <i>Dodoth</i>) which primarily inhabits Kaabong District
<i>Ekaracunait</i>	<i>ɲikaracuna</i>	adolescent boy or young man
<i>Ekarimojongoit/ Akarimojongoit</i>	<i>Dikarimojong/ Dakarimojong</i>	a male/female member of the Karamojong ethnic group (<i>Dakarimojong</i> or Karimojong) which

		which primarily inhabits the Moroto, Nakapiripirit and Napak districts
<i>Ekoko</i>	<i>ɲidwe</i>	small child
<i>Ejot/Ajot</i>	<i>Dijie/Dajie</i>	a male/female member of the Karamojong ethnic group (<i>Dijie</i> or <i>Jie</i>) which primarily inhabits Kotido District
<i>Elejilej</i>		small-scale income generating activities
<i>Emasenikoit/Amasenikoit</i>	<i>Dimaseniko/Damaseniko</i>	a male/female member of the <i>Dimaseniko</i> (Matheniko) section of the Karimojong which primarily inhabits Moroto District
<i>Epianait/Apianait</i>	<i>Dipian/Dapian</i>	a male/female member of the <i>Dipian</i> (Pian) section of the Karimojong which primarily inhabits Nakapiripirit District
<i>Ere</i>	<i>ɲireria</i>	home or manyatta

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Note on Language.....	3
Glossary.....	3
Executive Summary.....	6
Introduction.....	10
Background and Literature Review.....	11
Methods.....	19
Findings.....	22
The beginnings: Bokora children’s experiences before and during migration.....	22
Homecoming: the reintegration and resettlement programmes in Karamoja.....	27
Constructing better lives: assistance for former migrants.....	35
The aftermath: the children’s lives after return.....	42
Conclusion.....	48
Appendix I: Research Sites.....	50
Appendix II: Research Instrument.....	52
Appendix III: Informer Consent Script for Adult Research Participants.....	59
Appendix IV: Assent Script for Child Research Participants.....	61
Appendix V: Consent/Assent Form.....	62
Bibliography.....	63

Executive Summary

The Karimojong of northeastern Uganda historically depended on a transhumant agropastoral livelihood system which allowed them to combine livestock herding – the most reliable subsistence strategy in the drylands of East Africa – with cultivation. This system necessitated annual migration between largely permanent manyattas – the sites of agricultural production – and more mobile cattle kraals. From an early age, children – whose labour contributions formed an integral element of the Karimojong economy – joined their parents in their movements with livestock, helping young Karimojong to fulfil their labour obligations and prepare for adulthood through gradual assumption of increasingly demanding tasks.

This highly mobile way of life was subjected to increasing pressure during the course of the twentieth century as a number of natural and political shocks resulted in deaths of many Karimojong (as well as members of neighbouring ethnic groups) and erosion of their traditional livelihood system. In response to the changed circumstances, the Karimojong adjusted their mobility patterns. Among the Bokora, one of the three sections of the Karimojong, adolescents and adults began to migrate seasonally to Teso to engage in small-scale income generating activities. As numbers of livestock declined and the annual migration to kraals became increasingly dangerous, this phenomenon gradually ceased to follow traditional movements of cattle, while other Karimojong – both Bokora and Pian, members of another Karimojong section – began to migrate to towns of Eastern Uganda, often with their families, and established large communities in Busia, Iganga and Mbale (Namatala). In addition to these two trends, a newer phenomenon of independent migration of Bokora children to both rural and urban areas – especially Kampala – has emerged in the last decade as an important element of the transformed mobility behaviour of the Karimojong.

The influx of Bokora children to Kampala and other Ugandan towns has attracted considerable attention, but little is known about their experiences

during and – in particular – after their migration. Most migrants ultimately return to Karamoja – either spontaneously or supported by a reintegration or resettlement programme – but their ability to construct happier and fulfilling lives back home is encumbered by the environment which controls different phases of their migration and return and by the distressing experiences through which the children go during these successive stages.

The migrant children are often very vulnerable. They experience frequent hunger; they wear old and tattered clothes; they have no money for school uniforms, shoes, books, pens and various payments required of parents in ostensibly free government schools. Struggling to make ends meet, many parents demand excessive labour contributions from their children who find it difficult to fulfil their obligations. They suffer mistreatment at the hands of family members and are exposed to insecurity and intracommunal tensions.

The difficult and distressing experiences of Bokora children during their migration augment the distress brought about by illbeing endured at home. The plight of urban migrants, who face very difficult living conditions, mistreatment and marginalization in their destinations, is particularly harsh. Although the focus of reintegration and resettlement programming on urban areas is due chiefly to the visibility of young Bokora on the streets of Kampala and – to a lesser degree – smaller Ugandan towns, it can be justified by their relatively greater perilousness as migration destinations.

Return programmes targeted at Karimojong child migrants in Kampala were initiated in 2007. This early period saw many children forcibly removed from their urban environment. They were provided with little or no assistance and given no option to select their destination in Karamoja. Many of them subsequently relocated to their home villages or remigrated. Since 2008, return has become more organized – with NGOs assuming a leading role in programming – and efforts have been made to ensure its voluntary character. In response to the children's manifest desire to be reunited with their families, the focus has shifted from resettlement to reintegration in communities of origin.

Gradual refinement of return programming has not, however, eliminated all instances of violations present in earlier resettlement initiatives. A significant proportion of children returned after 2008 report forcible relocation to Karamoja. Some children are not provided with appropriate sustenance and accommodation while in care, while a small minority claim that they were mistreated by fellow returnees or by government officials or social workers. Return is not coordinated with parents and other members of the children's home communities, who struggle to provide the returnees with food and other necessities.

Return programming has generally incorporated provision of assistance, but it has been highly inconsistent. Early government-run initiatives suffered from inadequate planning and organization; support for returnees – children as well as adults who relocated to resettlement sites – was largely limited to some food items and establishment of basic infrastructure in the newly constructed villages. Expansion of the role played by NGOs has resulted in somewhat more advanced programme design and, consequently, greater focus on distribution of assistance deemed necessary to decrease the likelihood of the returnees' remigration and to help them to sustain themselves. The nature and value of items and services provided has varied, depending on the frequently limited amount of funding available to organizations responsible for return initiatives. Dissimilarities between different programmes have also resulted from lack of clearly defined objectives of assistance. Lack of consideration of the long-term needs of returnees, their families and communities, as well as insufficient funding, have constrained return programmes' potential to ensure lasting impacts of assistance, which has been mostly limited to inexpensive, one-off and short-term interventions.

Community members are not informed of the children's arrival, their concerns about the return are not addressed, and no efforts are made to assist them in the creation of a living environment which would no longer be conducive to child migration. Instead, their exclusion from receipt of assistance increases the commonly held perception of marginalization, neglect and lack of interest in the plight of the Karimojong, creates resentment towards the returnees and

– in the context of poverty and insecurity – may ultimately lead to deterioration of intracommunal relations. Furthermore, restriction of assistance to returnees and their families creates perverse incentives to migrate for other children. Poorer households are more likely to be involved in child migration but, because there is little intracommunal asset and income inequality among the Bokora, most of them are exposed to the factors which lead to migration.

The failure of currently offered forms of assistance to address the needs of the returnees, their families and communities and their paradoxical encouragement of child migration demonstrates the necessity of long-term, comprehensive approaches which target entire communities, establish close relationships with them and – harnessing the power of local institutions (primarily elders) and popular participation – help them to deal with the distress and trauma caused by factors present in their communities or encountered by children during their migration, and to begin the construction of a new foundation of their livelihoods. In the absence of such programming, the lives of the returnees and those close to them remain exposed the factors responsible for the large scale of Bokora child migration.

Introduction

The widespread participation of children from the Bokora (Dibokora) section of the Karimojong (Dikarimojong), the largest ethnic group in Karamoja in northeastern Uganda, in the phenomenon of child migration – which began in the early years of the twenty-first century – has attracted considerable attention of the government and other organizations, which have sought to contain the practice through programmes intended to initiate and facilitate the children’s resettlement – in specially established villages – or reintegration – in their communities of origin. No research has, however, been conducted on these latter stages of their migration. Little is known about the children’s experiences at various stages of the return process, the impact which these experiences have had on the returnees’ ability to construct happier and more fulfilling lives in Karamoja and, crucially, the effectiveness of return programming in addressing the causes of child migration.

This report endeavours to enhance our understanding of the children’s experiences and their consequences. The next chapter provides background information on Bokora child migration. It discusses the contributions which other scholars have made to our knowledge of the phenomenon of child migration and identifies gaps in this knowledge. It is followed by a methodological section which explains the methods which were chosen to fill these gaps and describes the data collection and analysis process. The findings are presented in four chapters which consider the impacts of the children’s experiences during various stages of the migration and return process and assess the effectiveness of the efforts to address the causes of the phenomenon. The conclusion summarizes the findings and suggests some measures which may contribute to the improvement of the children’s situation.

Background and Literature Review

The lives of the Karimojong have been centred on mobility since – following their Eastern Nilotic Ateker ancestors' migration to what is now Karamoja – they emerged as a distinct ethnic group in the mid-nineteenth century. Together with two related Karamojan Ateker groups, the Dodoth (Didoso) and Jie (Dijie), with whom they constitute the majority of Karamoja's population (they are jointly referred to as the Karamojong, or Dikaramojong), the Karimojong historically depended on a transhumant agropastoral livelihood system which allowed them to combine livestock herding – the most reliable subsistence strategy in the drylands of East Africa – with agricultural production (Ekaya, 2005; FEWS NET, 2005; Knaute, 2009a; Knighton, 2010). Due to limited and unpredictable rainfall and consequent droughts crops often fail in Karamoja, but cultivation provided the Karimojong with an important additional source of nutrition, helping them to successfully weather shocks to which their marginal habitat is frequently exposed (Mamdani, 1982). Because agricultural activity made nomadic way of life – practiced, for instance, by the Turkana, a closely related Ateker ethnic group, in their Rift Valley lands to the east of Karamoja – the Karimojong developed a dual habitation system comprised of largely permanent *ɲireria* (manyattas; singular: *ere*), constructed in locations suitable for agriculture and animal husbandry during the wet season, and *ɲawuyoi* (kraals; singular: *awi*), in areas receiving more rainfall, to which cattle would be taken during the dry season (Gray et al., 2003; Stites et al., 2007a; Stites and Akabwai, 2010; Stites et al., 2010). Many *ɲawuyoi* were situated in relatively fertile areas of southern and western Karamoja, but some were established in the territories of the neighbouring Iteso, Kumam and Langi, to which the Karimojong would travel annually, establishing close relationships with host populations (Czuba, 2012b; Gulliver, 1972).

All but the oldest and frailest members of Karimojong society participated in these migrations, contributing labour expected of them in an economic system structured – like in many other agropastoralist and pastoralist societies – by gender and age (Hodgson, 2000). Karimojong women were (and remain)

responsible for most elements of agricultural production, including clearing the land, planting, weeding and watering crops, as well as for milking and watering animals, gathering wild greens and fruits, collecting firewood, fetching water, preparation of food, its transport between *ɲireria* and *ɲawuyoi*, other domestic duties, and caring for children. Men's work focused on livestock, their families' most important assets, and included both participation in cattle raids – commonly practiced by the Karimojong and other ethnic groups in the region – and defence against them (Stefansky Huisman, 2011; Stites et al., 2007a). Children, both very young ones (*ɲidwe*; singular: *ekoko*) and adolescents (*ɲikaracuna*, or boys; singular: *ekaracunait*; and *ɲapesur*, or girls; singular: *apese*), also played an integral, and essential, role in the economic and social life of their families and communities, including its migratory aspects. Participation in their families' – and communities' – migrations allowed children to fulfil their labour obligations and prepare for adulthood through gradual assumption of increasingly demanding tasks (Czuba, 2012b).

This highly mobile way of life was subjected to increasing pressure during the course of the twentieth century as a number of natural and political shocks threatened to destroy Karimojong society. Ugandan colonial and postcolonial authorities, in an attempt to limit migration and raiding, promoted alternative livelihood strategies – particularly sedentary agriculture – despite their unsuitability for Karamoja's inhospitable environment (Gray, 2000; Knighton, 2003; Mamdani, Kasoma an Katende, 1992). These efforts, intended to establish state control over the Karimojong and their neighbours, were often heavy-handed; frequent use of force against Karamojans ultimately backfired when, following the collapse of Idi Amin's government in 1979, arms depots at Kotido and Moroto were looted by the Jie and Matheniko (Dimaseniko; one of three sections of the Karimojong), respectively, effectively crippling the authority of the Ugandan state in Karamoja for the next three decades. During the years of the great Karamojan disequilibrium after 1979, Karamoja experienced increased ethnic conflict, previously unknown friction between Karimojong sections (the Bokora and the Pian, or Dipian, as well as the Matheniko), clashes with the Ugandan army, and challenges to indigenous

governance structures. Combined with a series of droughts, changing weather patterns and disease outbreaks, these shocks resulted in deaths of thousands of Karamojans and erosion of traditional livelihood systems (Czuba, 2012a; Gray, 2003; Knighton, 1990 and 2006a; McKinney, 2008; Mirzeler and Young, 2000; Mubiru, 2010; Olowo Onyango, 2010; Oxfam, 2008; Stites et al., 2007a).

The Karimojong responded to the changed circumstances with an adjustment of their mobility patterns. Among the Bokora, adolescents and adults began to migrate seasonally to Teso – the land of the Iteso and Kumam, with whom they had existing relationships – to engage in *elejilej*, or small-scale income generating activities, for the host populations. As numbers of livestock declined and the annual migration to *nawuyoi* became increasingly dangerous, this phenomenon gradually ceased to follow traditional movements of cattle. Some Karimojong, Pian as well as Bokora, also began to migrate to towns of Eastern Uganda, often with their families, and they established large communities in Busia, Iganga and Mbale (Namatala). Numbers of migrants increased gradually during the 1980s and 1990s as multiple shocks eroded their ability to continue their ancestors' way of life (Czuba, 2012b). There is some evidence of the presence of Karamojan (most likely Karimojong) street children in Eastern Ugandan urban centres during this period (Young, 2004), but large-scale migration of unaccompanied Karimojong children, as well as of single women with children, only becomes evident in the early 2000s (Czuba, 2012b; Sundal, 2010). In reaction to essentially incessant raiding (by which the Bokora were affected to a much greater extent than other Karimojong as a result of unequal disarmament of 2001-2002), which effectively deprived their families of livestock, the basis of their livelihood system, and led to deaths of many of their relations and neighbours, large numbers of children from the Lokopo and Lopeei sub-counties of what is now the Bokora-dominated Napak District began to migrate independently to rural and urban locations across the country. Considerable Karimojong presence in many parts of Uganda, extensive social networks and familiarity with new patterns of migration produced by the networks has encouraged further growth of the phenomenon which

subsequently spread to other Napak sub-counties, as well as – to a much smaller extent – to the Moroto and Nakapiripirit districts inhabited by the Matheniko and Pian, respectively. The Bokora dominance of the phenomenon can be attributed (in addition to widespread loss of lives and livestock during the raids in the early years of the twentieth century) to their longstanding close relations with the Iteso and Kumam, relatively greater exposure to missionary activity and Western education (compared to other Karimojong), and the establishment – in the wake of the wave of raiding in the early 2000s – of army-controlled kraals in Napak; these kraals continue to prevent Bokora children from fulfilling their labour obligations to their families (Czuba, 2012b).

Although no statistical data are available, the numbers of Karimojong child migrants are recognized to be substantial (Stites et al., 2007a; Stites and Akabwai, 2012; Sundal, 2010). The children – girls more often than boys – migrate primarily to Kampala, towns of Eastern Uganda, and rural areas of Teso. In agricultural and pastoral destinations, they commonly undertake *elejilej* based on skills acquired in their home communities in the context of the agropastoral Karimojong economy; in urban centres, many migrants engage in panhandling, while others help traders to carry, sort and measure produce, sell charcoal or collect food left unconsumed in markets or spilt from trailers by inattentive drivers. They face considerable hardships during their migration, including exploitation by employers and violence perpetrated by local residents and government officials (Czuba, 2012b; Sundal, 2010).

Largely due to the high visibility of child panhandlers on the streets of Kampala, since the mid-2000s the phenomenon has attracted the attention of the Ugandan government, which has attempted to stop the influx of Karimojong migrants through a number of initiatives intended to return them to their home communities or resettle them in specially constructed villages in Karamoja. A number of adult Karimojong, displaced from their homes by poverty and violence, disappointed with life in Kampala and assured of government assistance, agreed to be resettled in Kobulin in Napak in early 2006, but subsequent relocations often had involuntary character. Starting in early 2007, migrant children, in particular, faced regular roundups on the

streets of Kampala and forced return to Karamoja (Stites et al., 2007a; Sundal, 2010), although many children have also always returned spontaneously and some engage in circular migration (Czuba, 2012b).

Historical Karimojong mobility patterns, their development and connections to contemporary migration practices, migrants' experiences in destination sites (at least the urban ones), and government response to their presence have been discussed in a number of studies, including IOM's research project on causes and mechanisms of Karimojong child migration completed by this author (Czuba, 2012b). Our understanding of the children's experiences during and after return, and the impacts of both migration and reintegration and resettlement initiatives on the children, their families and communities, however, remains inadequate. The previous IOM report finds no evidence that migration affects family relations, but it only considers this issue briefly and does not address potentially significant consequences of the method of return. Assessment of the return initiatives previously undertaken by Ugandan authorities and non-governmental organizations – and their short- and long-term effects – can, therefore, shed light on important aspects of child migration and on the needs of the Bokora affected by the phenomenon, as well as provide valuable data to inform IOM's CRTU project, which is focused on reintegration of those former child migrants who have been identified as victims of exploitation and human trafficking.

Existing literature does not provide much guidance for such an inquiry, as little information on reintegration and resettlement of child migrants is available. Reintegration itself is a poorly defined term which is generally applied to any reinsertion of a migrant into her home community and society (Black and Koser, 1999). Although its use typically assumes provision of protection and assistance to the former migrant, there are no commonly recognized and universally applicable norms guiding determination of the character of such support, its beneficiaries, or the conditions in which it should be offered. The procedures of IOM, which provides reintegration assistance to failed asylum seekers, stranded migrants, victims of trafficking and some other vulnerable groups (such as unaccompanied child migrants), are notable due to their

identification of necessary assistance components. IOM recommends provision of accommodation, healthcare services, counselling, financial and legal assistance, reinsertion into educational systems, vocational training (including apprenticeships), support for entrepreneurial and other income generating activities, job placement, and wage subsidies as measures conducive to successful reintegration. Individual assessment of a recipient's physical, psychological, psychiatric, legal, social and economic needs, her aspirations, available opportunities, and perceived motivation are considered necessary to determine the contents of a particular reintegration package (IOM, 2007). Similar types of assistance may be, presumably, beneficial to resettled migrants, but domestic resettlement (as opposed to resettlement of refugees in a third country) is not addressed in literature.

This lack of clarity is indicative of the inadequacy of research conducted to date on return migration in general (Arowolo, 2000). Only a handful of studies evaluate impacts of reintegration interventions. They emphasize the importance of careful programme design as a prerequisite of successful reintegration of former migrants and assert that programming should be sensitive to particular contexts and incorporate recognition of the value of local knowledge, popular participation, inclusion of traditional institutions in decision-making, and enhancement of human and social capital (Black and Koser, 1999; Haug, 2002; Malkki, 1995).

There is also little information on consequences of return, especially in the context of reintegration or resettlement programmes similar to those implemented in Karamoja. The exception is relatively plentiful literature on the experiences of former child soldiers and other children associated with armed forced and armed groups (CAAFAG) following their return to home communities. Such children's exposure to atrocities sets them apart from most other displaced and migrant children, including the Bokora, but because their plight has attracted considerable scholarly attention and resulted in a number of valuable studies, their experiences can inform our understanding of the aftermath of Karimojong child migration.

Much of the research on CAAFAG reintegration has focused on economic and psychological impacts of the children's experiences. Many young people affected by the civil war in Sierra Leone report persistent psychological distress or trauma centred on the violence which they witnessed or perpetrated (Betancourt et al., 2008). Many reintegration interventions in the country – as well as in other settings – have, consequently, focused on provision of psychological and psychosocial support. Although such assistance is appreciated by many returnees (Williamson, 2006), long-term impact of psychological distress is unclear. In Northern Uganda, authors of a survey of war-affected youth find that acute trauma among children abducted by the Lord's Resistance Army is limited to those exposed to the most violence and that – although violence perpetrated by child soldiers frequently directly affected their families and communities – abduction is not correlated with social alienation (Annan et al., 2011; Blattman, 2006; Blattman and Annan, 2008). They postulate that positive community response to combatant return diminishes social exclusion and consequent distress. Finding that abduction's large and broad-based long-term impact on skills and income is the result of time spent away from home (rather than war trauma), they question the precedence of psychological and psychosocial assistance over economic and educational programmes in many reintegration interventions (Annan, Brier and Aryemo, 2009; Annan et al., 2011; Blattman, 2006).

Irrespective of the type of intervention considered to be most beneficial to its recipients, school attendance is recognized as a particularly effective method of assistance provision, due to both the negative impact of abduction on education outcomes (Blattman and Annan, 2008) and the key role of schools in provision of psychosocial recovery services (Betancourt et al., 2008). In addition, while the importance of individual-level factors is noted (Humphreys and Weinstein, 2007), prospects of reintegration are believed to be increased by engagement with receiving communities – through consultations with local leaders or creation of forums through which community members can express their opinions and anxieties – and provision of assistance to different categories of vulnerable people (Akello, Richter and Reis, 2006; Williamson, 2006; Zack-Williams, 2006). Targeting programmes to all war-affected youth

based on well-identified needs is thought to be more effective and less stigmatizing than exclusive focus on combatant status (Annan, Brier and Aryemo, 2009).

The unique character of Bokora child migration, which is rooted in historical Karimojong mobility patterns and conceptions of childhood, brought about by natural, political and socioeconomic developments in Karamoja in recent decades – and consequent suffering – and driven by the distinctive response of the Bokora to their changed circumstances, requires careful, context-sensitive investigation of the ways in which the experiences before, during and after migration affect the lives of children, their families and communities. This task can be, however, guided by the literature on CAAFAG, which identifies key challenges faced by returnees and points to potential solutions to their hardships. While Bokora children's experiences are very different from those of CAAFAG, reintegration programming in post-conflict setting offers valuable insights which can help us to structure the examination of the quality and effectiveness of return initiatives in Karamoja. Since the CAAFAG literature demonstrates that assistance provided to returnees can make a significant contribution to their successful reintegration, such an assessment is an indispensable component of a broader analysis of former migrants' experiences. The following chapters will, therefore, discuss different aspects of Bokora children's migration and return experiences, including in relation to reintegration and resettlement programming, to provide a comprehensive examination of the factors which contribute to their ability to construct happier lives in Karamoja.

Methods

Extensive field research was conducted both in child migrants' communities of origin and in resettlement villages in order to reveal previously unknown information about the children's experiences. Purposive sampling techniques were used to select research sites in Napak District. Because nearly all Karimojong child migrants are Bokora, fieldwork was limited to Napak.

Key informants (social workers who have worked with children returned to Karamoja) identified communities in which child migrants have been reintegrated or resettled. Based on the informants' recommendations, twenty research sites in Napak were selected: five in Matany Sub-county, four in Lokopo and Lopeei sub-counties, three in Lorengechora and Ngoleriet sub-counties and one in Iriiri Sub-county (the list of research sites can be found in Appendix I). Following site selection, local leaders (Local Council 1 chairpersons and elders) were approached and asked for consent and support for research activities in their communities.

Qualitative approaches developed to provide rich, in-depth data about complex social phenomena were deemed most suitable for use in the study and determined selection of data collection techniques. Ninety individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with former child migrants and their parents and guardians. Fifty-one children and thirty-nine parents and guardians were interviewed. While the majority of the children had participated in return initiatives, eight spontaneous returnees were also interviewed to enable comparison of the two groups' experiences. Individual interviews were complemented by twenty focus group discussions (FGDs) with adult community members of different age, gender and social status (both involved in child migration or not), one of which was held in every research site. Overall, two hundred and seventy-seven informants participated in data collection, which took place over an eight-week period between the 24th July and the 1st October 2012.

Data collection followed a research instrument developed for the project (Appendix II), but questions could be modified during the course of an interview or FGD in order to capture the participants' knowledge more fully, enable them to express their views and opinions, and reveal local knowledge and understanding.

Member checks were applied at the end of each interview and FGD to ensure descriptive and interpretive validity of findings. They were complemented by iterative questioning and frequent debriefing sessions at the IOM office in Moroto. A Dakaramojong-speaking research team member took detailed notes in English. In addition, all interviews and FGDs were recorded, so that they could be transcribed and translated in situations when important information had not been included in the interview notes.

Assent was obtained before each interview and FGD and participants were fully informed of the nature of the research project in order to prevent any breach of ethical guidelines (consent and assent script and forms for adult and child participants can be found in appendices III-V). Respondents were guaranteed anonymity to ensure their ability to speak freely about their experiences and to avoid response bias. Obtained data were stored in a locked compartment and on password-protected computers. All hard copies of interview and FGD notes were destroyed following transcription.

Analysis of data incorporated both observer impression and coding techniques. Nvivo, a computer assisted qualitative analysis software package, was used to code sources, distinguish important themes, trends and patterns, and aid interpretation of data. Every attempt was made to ensure accuracy and quality of findings through a number of techniques used during data collection and analysis. Aforementioned strategies employed during the data collection process – member checks, iterative questioning and debriefing sessions – were complemented by method and data triangulation to achieve credibility (internal validity).

Although semi-structured interviews and FGDs are similar methods and suffer from the same limitations as types of the interview, method triangulation is possible as it is recognized that simultaneous use of different methods compensates for their individual shortcomings and exploits their respective benefits (Brewer and Hunter, 1989; Guba, 1981). In addition, inclusion of different sites and categories of informants in the sample allowed data triangulation.

Findings

For Karimojong child migrants, coming home is often a complex, difficult and prolonged process, rather than a single event. Their ability to construct happier and more fulfilling lives upon return is encumbered by the environment which controls different phases of their migration and return and by the experiences through which the children go during these successive stages. The direct repercussions of the temporally-arranged aspects of migration and return for former migrants' subsequent way of life indicate that these two seemingly distinct phenomena – which represent, respectively, outward and homecoming movements in relation to communities of origin – effectively constitute, as far as the children's post-migration experiences are concerned, a single process. The combination of the impacts of its different stages ultimately determines the shape of the returnees' future existence. Investigation of their nature and consequences is, therefore, imperative to the development of a better understanding of the migrants' return and post-return experiences. Because of their sequential arrangement, they can be discussed in chronological order. The following sections, therefore, consider the children's experiences before, during and after migration, respectively, and the ways in which they have influenced the returnees' subsequent lives. Special attention is given to the return initiatives and the specific impacts which their organization, administration and components have had on the children's ability to establish a new way of life.

The beginnings: Bokora children's experiences before and during migration

The shocks which Karamoja experienced in recent decades have fundamentally eroded the livelihoods of the Karimojong (and neighbouring ethnic groups), the vast majority of whom have seen reduction in food intake and standards of living (Czuba, 2012b; McKinney, 2009; Stefansky Huisman, 2011). Households of Bokora children involved in migration appear to have

been affected by these developments to a degree even greater than the general population. Few of them own cattle or other animals – which have been lost to disease or raids by Matheniko Karimojong and Jie – while scarce Napak rainfall limits their ability to rely on agricultural production. A significant number of affected households is headed by men incapable of supporting their families due to age, disease or injury (often as a result of wounds sustained in raiding), while in others, female household heads have been widowed or abandoned by their husbands. Some children have lost both of their parents and live with grandparents or other relatives. These poorest members of Karimojong society rely predominantly on a very limited range of basic *elejilej*, such as charcoal burning and sale of firewood, thorns (for construction of fences around *njireria*) or rats. The income which these activities contribute to the household budget is frequently insufficient to ensure reliable supply of food, even when combined with assistance received from the World Food Programme (WFP) or its partner organizations. Some of the households have no bedding (and sleep on WFP food distribution sacks) or even own homes.

Children who subsequently choose to migrate experience frequent hunger; they wear old and tattered clothes; they have no money for school uniforms, shoes, books, pens and various payments required of parents in ostensibly free government schools. Struggling to make ends meet, many parents demand excessive labour contributions from their children who find it difficult to fulfil their obligations:

I used to go for elejilej in Matany. I would fetch more than thirty Gerry cans of water every day. This is why asked my mother to allow me to go to Kampala.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

There is widespread sense of insecurity. Although the number of raids has reduced, *njireria* located away from trading centres (and barracks), in particular, are still exposed to violence and loss of assets:

There were many raids here. The boy saw many people die and decided to seek refuge in town.

(Parent from Lokopo Sub-county)

Some children suffer mistreatment at the hands of family members: parents, aunts and uncles, or elder siblings. Most of them are beaten; some may be pressurized to make decisions which are considered to be necessary means of providing support to their families, but undesirable to the children themselves:

I left because my mother told me that it was time for me to start getting my own food, because she had been feeding me since childhood. She wanted me to get married, but I am still young.

(Returnee from Lokopo Sub-county)

Likely in reaction to widespread illbeing (including hunger) and inability to address it through traditionally practiced raids of cattle from neighbouring ethnic groups, thefts have become common, leading to increased intracommunal tensions. Community members can be accused of theft or cooperation with security forces (which, due to confiscation of guns, are held responsible for people's inability to defend themselves), like the research participant from Ngoleriet Sub-county who, after her husband and son's deaths in raids, was accused of revealing the presence of arms in the ere to the Ugandan People's Defence Force (UPDF), leading to conflict with neighbours, stigmatization, destruction of food stored in the family granary and, ultimately, migration to Kampala with her thirteen year-old daughter.

Other children, as well as – or, in some cases, instead of – being compelled to leave their homes, are drawn to migration destinations by the popularity and social acceptability of the phenomenon of child migration, as many of them have relatives or friends who have previously left Karamoja (cf. Young, 2003). Such children migrate to join people whom they know or simply rely on advice from them to select a destination with significant Karimojong presence and, consequently, a network of support for migrants.

In many cases, migration is a survival strategy initiated by children in response to hunger, inability to attend school and fulfil their labour obligations, work beyond their physical capabilities and unsuitable for their age, insecurity, mistreatment and other challenges which they face in their communities (cf. Ansell and van Blerk, 2004). Most migrants make the decision to migrate themselves; others are instructed to do so by their parents. While some children, especially younger ones, leave with their parents (or with mothers who have left their husbands or been widowed or abandoned by them), and others are entrusted to relatives (most commonly aunts), the majority – at least among those young people who were subsequently returned to Karamoja by the government or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and interviewed for this study – appear to migrate independently. Many migrants do not seek their parents' permission before they leave their homes. A small number of children is recruited to work in other parts in Uganda by strangers who approach them in markets and other public spaces.

The migrant children are likely to be their parents' oldest offspring who still reside at home: too young to have married, but old enough to be either capable of exercising agency – and making the decision to migrate – or deemed sufficiently mature to survive the challenges of migration and return with money or food for the family. Some of the poorest parents delegate the responsibility for some of their children's upbringing and upkeep to more prosperous relatives and focus on raising one child; with her siblings' wellbeing assured, such a child may then migrate in hopes of supporting her parents. Participation in migration is not necessarily limited to one child per household. When a mother leaves Karamoja, her children usually accompany her (Sundal, 2010). In some cases, they become separated and children who began their migration as part of a family unit are forced to provide for themselves (and, possibly, their younger siblings). Other children choose to or are instructed to migrate together with their siblings.

Many migrants go to rural areas in Teso, where they engage in *elejilej*; a significant number of them move to urban centres in other parts of Uganda,

most commonly to Kampala. Time spent away from home is usually shorter for migrants to Teso, many of whom engage in circular migration and return to Karamoja for the wet season to assist their parents in the fields. Migrants to urban locations typically spend between two and six months in their destinations, but their migration can be much longer. Some research participants' children left a number of years ago and have never returned. Because it has attracted considerable attention, urban migration is frequently interrupted by government interventions and children may return home earlier than they originally intended.

The government's (and NGOs') focus on urban migrants is due chiefly to the visibility of young Bokora on the streets of Kampala (as well as some smaller Ugandan towns), but it can be justified by the relatively harsher nature of such children's migration experiences compared to their Teso-bound peers. While rural migrants' economic behaviour is comparable to the work which they are expected to perform in their home communities and is seen as a legitimate source of income, migrants to towns commonly either panhandle or collect unconsumed food from markets. These activities place them at the bottom of the social hierarchy (Stites and Akabwai, 2012; Sundal, 2010) and their inferior position is the source of shame and exposes urban migrants to marginalization, stigmatization and abuse in host communities:

Everywhere you go, people abuse you and beat you.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

The Baganda [the dominant ethnic group in Kampala – KC] would kick me and steal my money when I was begging.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

Boda-boda [motorcycle taxi – KC] riders would knock people down. It happened to me one day and no one helped me.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

Urban migrants are also much more likely to miss meals and lack adequate shelter. While both food and accommodation are readily available in towns, children need money – which is often difficult to acquire – to pay for them, while in Teso they are usually provided by the employer.

The difficult and distressing experiences of Bokora children during their migration augment the distress brought about by illbeing which many of them endured at home. Upon return to Karamoja, in addition to facing the challenges which caused them to leave their homes, they often have to deal with memories of hunger, fear and mistreatment during migration. In this situation, their experiences of return can play a crucial role in alleviating – or aggravating – their distress and, consequently, contribute to – or impede – successful reintegration or resettlement.

Homecoming: the reintegration and resettlement programmes in Karamoja

Return programmes aimed at Karimojong child migrants in Kampala were initiated in 2007, when the first group of children was rounded up by representatives of the Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), detained at Kampiringisa National Youth Rehabilitation Centre (a facility constructed to serve juvenile delinquents) and sent to newly established resettlement sites in Napak – such as Apeitolim in Lokopo Sub-county, Kobulin in (what is now) Lorengechora Sub-county, and Lomaratoit in Iriiri Sub-county – where they joined adult Bokora (and their children) who have returned from Kampala. This period saw many children forcibly removed from their urban environment. They were provided with little or no assistance and given no option to select their destination in Karamoja. Many of them subsequently relocated to their home villages or remigrated. Since 2008, return has become more organized – with NGOs assuming a leading role in programming – and efforts have been made to ensure its voluntary character. In response to the children's manifest desire to be reunited with their families, the focus has shifted from resettlement to reintegration in communities of origin.

Gradual refinement of return programming has not, however, eliminated all instances of violations present in earlier resettlement initiatives. A significant proportion of children returned after 2008 report forcible relocation to Karamoja (research participants included children reintegrated and resettled by different organizations between 2007 and May 2012). Although, due to the nature of their experiences, most urban migrants wished to return home – and some were in the process of raising funds for transport to Napak when they were captured – most were not satisfied with the method of removal from their destination. Many children were rounded up in the streets where they worked, prohibited from returning to their accommodation to collect their money and other belongings, and sent to Kampiringisa or to Naguru Remand Home in Kampala, from which they were transported to NGO-run temporary shelters in Karamoja.

Continuation of involuntary removals exposes children to additional distress. Furthermore, their instigators' motivations are difficult to understand given the migrants' desire to be reunited with their families in Karamoja, which is stated by all returnee research participants and echoed by their parents, who express concern about their children's wellbeing during migration and find it difficult to sustain themselves without their labour contribution to the household economy. Little effort has been made, however, to engage Karimojong communities in Kampala and other destinations, and to establish channels which could be used to inform migrant children that transport and assistance are available if they choose to return to Karamoja.

Urban migrants' experiences generally improve following removal from the streets, although lack of information upon arrival at Kampiringisa or Naguru may deepen their distress, as staff members do not necessarily take time to explain their institutions' (and the government's) intentions to the children. Once the migrants understand that they are not in danger, their anxiety is mostly relieved. Arrival in Karamoja is generally a source of jubilation for the children, many of whom have been away from their homes for many months. The opportunity to play with their peers and relax in the knowledge that their

welfare – including provision of food and security – is ensured and prayer sessions – which direct children’s thoughts toward the sacred and away from their previous experiences – offer a welcome respite from the difficulties of migration. They are provided with water for bathing and, in most cases, with soap. Some children are given clothes to replace the ones in which they arrived in Karamoja (although the fact that, in some groups of returnees, only some children received clothing is a cause of concern as it may contribute to their sense of exclusion).

A minority of children receive markedly worse treatment. Some are not provided with sufficient sustenance and go to sleep hungry. In other cases, accommodation in temporary shelters in Karamoja is either not ready for the arrival of returnees – who are forced to sleep out of doors, exposed to the elements – or unsuitable (for example, too small to house the number of children for whom it is intended). Other returnees, particularly those who are accommodated in the shelter in Moroto, experience anxiety and fear as a result of local people’s reactions to their return:

The Matheniko would come to the fence and laugh at us. They said that all Bokora like begging.

(Returnee from Lorengechora Sub-county)

I was afraid of people, because they called us dogs who had gone to beg. They were laughing at us. They blamed us for shaming the Karimojong across the world.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

Some children are mistreated by fellow returnees or by government officials or social workers. Research participants report that they were beaten or had food stolen by older Karimojong children, suggesting poor supervision of facilities in which they were accommodated. According to a small number of testimonies, officials entrusted with ensuring the children’s wellbeing can also be directly involved in mistreatment. One returnee asserts that her money was stolen by KCCA officials. Social workers often do not respond to children’s

inquiries about the plans for their future or provide inadequate information. Some lie to the children or give them false promises of future assistance. In a number of cases, returnees were threatened by the social workers, who claimed that they would be killed or imprisoned should they remigrate. Other lapses are less alarming, but suggest inadequate organization of the return process. For example, family tracing is not always completed before the return, potentially leaving the children – already distressed by their experiences – stranded until they are correctly identified:

They forced us to get on the bus in Busia. I was scared and, when we arrived in Lokopo, I could not remember where our home was.

Fortunately, some woman from my village saw me and took me home.

(Returnee from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

Due to unsatisfactory family tracing, many parents do not know that their children have been returned to Karamoja and rely on rumours until they travel to the shelters in which returnees are held or until their child is brought to their home. Returnees are usually provided with transport to their homes, but in some cases parents have to travel to the shelters – which can be located many kilometres away – to retrieve them. Contact is sometimes established with sub-county officials, but they may not inform parents of their child's arrival. Lack of communication may lead to waste of time (more productively spent on agricultural production or *elejilej*) and unnecessary anxiety for parents:

I first went to Lokopo, because they told me that children had been taken there. When I arrived there, I was told that the returned children had all gone back to Kampala. I was very worried but, fortunately, I found my son in a house in Lokopo.

(Parent from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

Because they are not prepared for the return, many parents struggle to provide food for their children. Their households are frequently exposed to

hunger and do not have food reserves which can be used to feed additional household members.

Return home is a joyful occasion, but – for urban migrants – it is often overshadowed by their negative experiences, which contrast with those of the Karimojong children who choose to migrate to rural areas. In addition to the particularly difficult conditions of life in Kampala and other urban centres, children whose return is coordinated by the government and NGOs are exposed – largely as a result of poor planning and management – to the aforementioned upsets, which can augment their distress. At the same time, rural migrants, who benefit from safer destinations and established patterns of circular migration (which limit movement to Teso to the dry season; for this reason parents know when they can expect their children to return), have attracted no outside attention and are able to go back home when they are ready – having accumulated an amount of food and money sufficient to help their families to sustain themselves and to pay school fees – and in safer conditions than those reported by returnees from towns.

Upon return, former urban migrants also frequently encounter a more challenging environment than their peers who have come back from rural areas. Their situation was particularly difficult in the early period, when many children were relocated to resettlement sites:

I was afraid of the people there because Kobulin was not our place. I really wanted them to take me to our home (...) They insulted us all the time, saying that we were beggars (...) We asked the people who had brought us there to take us home, and they let us go.

(Returnee from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

The conditions in resettlement sites were not universally substandard. Some returnees received assistance which helped them to recover from the experiences of migration. Some of the children who were relocated to the new settlements together with their parents stayed there, but initial lack of a sense

community (which has, however, emerged in recent years) and yearning for home ultimately convinced many to return to their villages.

Urban migrants, who often left their communities to fulfil labour obligations to their families but – unlike most of their peers who migrate to rural areas – were unsuccessful in their attempt to acquire food and money, are concerned about the reception which they are likely to receive:

I was worried about coming home. I was thinking: What will I take to my parents? How will people at home look at me when I bring nothing?

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

This apprehensiveness is mostly unwarranted, as the returnees' parents universally express satisfaction with their children's return, although some worry about their ability to ensure their expanded households' wellbeing. Parents' delight in seeing their children may be increased by expectation of material benefits, as some urban (and most rural) migrants bring money or food with them:

My parents know that I always bring money for them when I come back from Kampala.

(Returnee from Lokopo Sub-county)

My parents were happy. They slaughtered a chicken for me and I bought ekwete [local alcoholic beverage – KC] for them. The trouble with parents is that, when they see that you are back from Kampala, they know that you have money.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

Few family members, however, convey disappointment if the returnees fail to contribute to household assets:

Only my grandmother was angry because I did not bring any food.

(Returnee from Lokopo Sub-county)

Migrants returned without proper family tracing face greater challenges. Some of them are orphans who are brought to their community of origin even though they no longer have family members who live there and can provide for them. Children who accompanied their parents to the migration destination are sometimes returned while other family members remain in Kampala or another urban centre. This scenario was particularly common in the early period, when little effort was made to ensure ordered and voluntary character of returns, but such cases have not entirely disappeared. Both orphans and unaccompanied children depend for their survival on generosity of extended family or, occasionally, strangers. The strong familial ties and community ethos which characterize Karimojong society ensure that such children receive necessary assistance, but – given the poverty of most Bokora households – it may be given only grudgingly and the returnees may, consequently, feel marginalized and unwanted:

I was thinking: Why have they brought the children to Karamoja again? Where will I get money and food for helping her? She is an orphan, not my child.

(Guardian from Lokopo Sub-county)

Some of the children who are reunited with their families and can count on familial support also encounter negative reactions to their return. Community members are acutely aware of the perceptions of the Karimojong created by children who work and live on the streets of Ugandan cities:

They are spoilt children who have shamed Karamoja.

(Focus group discussion participant from Lopeei Sub-county)

The returnees are children who do not respect their parents, because they went away without asking for permission. They have brought shame to our community because the whole world knows that Karimojong children are beggars.

(Focus group discussion participant from Lopeei Sub-county)

Consequently, returnees may be exposed to insults, as well as resentment of those parents whose offspring has not returned and who worry about their children's wellbeing. Simultaneously, however, community members usually realize how difficult the migrants' experiences have been. The scale of the phenomenon of child migration in Napak ensures that most of them are well informed of the conditions in destination areas. In fact, rumour can serve to exaggerate the true extent of suffering which migrants face:

We did not know that children would be returned home, but we were happy when they came back, because we were tired of hearing that Karimojong children were tortured in Kampala.

(Focus group discussion participant from Matany Sub-county)

Such hyperbolized impressions usually contribute to a warm reception received by children, but they may also lead to unsubstantiated or inflated fears of potential consequences of the return for the migrants' communities. Many of their residents are concerned about the diseases which migrants could have contracted while away. Others worry about future conduct of children who – in many cases – left their homes without parental consent and whose independent lives in – particularly urban – destinations, where they were exposed to alien behavioural norms, did not conform to the Karimojong understanding of young people's roles and social status. This anxiety could be reduced by better information about the children's experiences – including the dangers to which they were exposed – and facilitation of intergenerational dialogue within communities affected by child migration. The return initiatives frequently aggravate the children's distress but, due to their organized nature, they have the capacity to help the returnees to address the hardships responsible for their migration, as well as to deal with the memories of their negative experiences. For this reason, provision of assistance is potentially the most important element of the return process and the quality of returnees' lives in Karamoja is to a large extent determined by its success.

Constructing better lives: assistance for former migrants

Return programming has generally incorporated provision of assistance, but it has been highly inconsistent. Early government-run initiatives suffered from inadequate planning and organization; support for returnees – children as well as adults who relocated to resettlement sites – was largely limited to some food items and establishment of basic infrastructure in the newly constructed villages. Expansion of the role played by NGOs has resulted in somewhat more advanced programme design and, consequently, greater focus on distribution of assistance deemed necessary to decrease the likelihood of the returnees' remigration and to help them to sustain themselves. The nature and value of items and services provided has varied, depending on the frequently limited amount of funding available to organizations responsible for return initiatives. Dissimilarities between different programmes have also resulted from lack of clearly defined objectives of assistance. Lack of consideration of the long-term needs of returnees, their families and communities, as well as insufficient funding, have constrained return programmes' potential to ensure lasting impacts of assistance, which has been mostly limited to inexpensive, one-off and short-term interventions.

Among those returnees who are provided with assistance, the vast majority receives basic household items. Depending on a particular package, they can be given a number of objects from a list which has remained largely unchanged for some years. It includes saucepans, plates, cups, spoons, knives, pangas (machetes), hoes, basins, Gerry cans, clothes, shoes, blankets, tarpaulin, mosquito nets and soap. Some returnees are additionally provided with a limited amount of food – most commonly beans, maize (corn) and rice – which is sufficient for no more than a few weeks of consumption.

Allocation and delivery of assistance tend to be unsystematic and disorganized. Recipients are not consulted on the contents of their package and frequently complain that they received items which they did not require, while those which they needed were unavailable or given to other returnees. Because of inadequate budgeting, it is not uncommon for only some members

of a returnee group to receive assistance. In addition, variation between packages for different groups, including returnees reintegrated in the same or neighbouring communities over a short period of time – a result of lack of interorganizational coordination – creates perception of discrimination within households and communities provided with inferior support.

Most recipients – and their parents – report satisfaction with the assistance which they receive, although they note that food with which they are provided is insufficient for longer-term consumption, while the condition of other, more durable items deteriorates after a period of time (or, alternatively, they are stolen by thieves active in the insecure environment of Karamoja). This contentment is based on perceived value of assistance. Possession of household items ensures an increase in their owners' social status. Recipients, accustomed to neglect which they and their communities normally face, are additionally grateful for a short disruption of the unusual disinterestedness in their living conditions and provision of items which make their daily existence easier. This perspective, combined with confusion created by erosion of the traditional livelihood system, contributes to their inability to generate informed opinions on instruments which they need in changed circumstances in order to establish a new basis of sustenance. This situation is not unexpected in these difficult conditions – especially given that a sensible vision of the ways in which Karamojan economy can be adapted to the altered environment is yet to be formulated by the government or other actors – but it results in overestimation of the long-term value of assistance, which tends to be highly limited.

While mosquito nets – if correctly used (recipients do not receive training) – lead to reduction in rates of malarial infection and, consequently, to improvement of their health, and knives, pangas and hoes support agricultural production, other items with which returnees are commonly provided do little to contribute to a fundamental transformation of the migrants' – and their families' – livelihoods which is necessarily to ensure their ability to support themselves. Because assistance does not remove the factors which cause

child migration, many returnees choose to sell the contents of their reintegration packages and leave their *nigeria* again. After all:

What is the use of saucepans when there is no food?

(Parent from Lopeei Sub-county)

Provision of payments to schools – which cover basic expenses and enable returnees to obtain formal education – has been the only approach used in reintegration programmes which has the potential to address children’s longer-term needs. It has, however, been only offered to a very small number of children. Widespread desire for education among the returnees indicates their successful identification of one of the avenues which can help them to improve their lives and secure a better future for themselves, their families and communities, while lack of response to this demand further demonstrates inadequacy of reintegration initiatives:

I was not happy with the assistance: why did they give me blankets and not books or pens which would allow me to go to school?

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

Reintegration programmes’ inability to address the needs of their target population is ultimately the result of the absence of systematic efforts to identify and eliminate the causes of child migration. Irrespective of the assistance which they receive, the former migrants – and other young Bokora – continue to be exposed to the hardships they experienced before they left their homes.

Hunger which affects the returnees and their families is not alleviated by the food assistance received by some of them as part of their reintegration packages; at best, it can prevent remigration for the short time before the food is consumed. Many vulnerable Bokora households are provided with food by WFP and its partners organizations, but not all of them are included in the register of beneficiaries (food distribution records are imperfect and include some unexpected recipients, such as government officials, but leave out a

small proportion of those most in need) and the amount of food provided to those who are may not be sufficient for those families which have lost breadwinners or grown since the lists were compiled. Furthermore, while food assistance relieves suffering, it cannot address the causes of lack of food in Karamoja. Primarily for ideological reasons, the efforts to stimulate food production in the region – undertaken by WFP and other organizations – have focused on agriculture which, although an important aspect of the eroded traditional agropastoral economy, is subject to climatic limitations inherent in the marginal, changeable environment of Karamoja (which is characterized by frequent droughts) and, consequently, unlikely to ensure long-term food security. In contrast, attempts to reinvigorate livestock production in the region have been limited and lack government support.

Karamoja is currently undergoing transition from historically practiced modes of production – which have disintegrated as a result of the shocks which have affected the region in recent decades – to a modern monetized economy. In the absence of financial capital and skills, the region's embryonic capitalist economy requires high labour intensity in exchange for very small gains. In this context, many parents depend on their children's labour contribution which is necessary for their families' survival. Given the conditions, this work often exceeds the children's physical capabilities, but its ultimately limited value and lack of alternative opportunities are insufficient to ensure food security. Hunger and excessive labour are effectively inevitable consequences of the current economic situation and can only be addressed through systematic efforts to promote the development of more profitable and sustainable forms of production.

The inadequacy of available physical capital goods and human capital reduces the number of available solutions. The present shortage of tangible assets is unlikely to be addressed without restoration of the productive value of the land, which has largely disappeared with the loss of livestock. The historical success of the agropastoral economy of the Karimojong (and a number of neighbouring ethnic groups) indicates the existence of a viable strategy which can take advantage of the distinctive features of Karamoja's

environment. The example of other (agro)pastoralist areas of East Africa suggests that traditional forms of production can lead to creation of alternative forms of physical capital through commercialization of agricultural and pastoral production and, consequently, form a basis for a more diversified economy (cf. Barton et al., 2001; Berhanu and Fayissa, 2010; Desta and Coppock, 2004; Fernandez-Gimenez and Le Febre, 2006; Forstater, 2002; Fratkin, 2001; Helland, 2000; Tache, 2000; Tolera, 2000). This potential has not, however, had any effect on return programming. Assistance packages are not intended to encourage profitable economic behaviour among the returnees and their families and the items which they are given are – for the most part – consumption goods with little productive potential.

Development of human capital can be initiated through provision of schooling and vocational training. The expansion of existing components of some reintegration programmes, which provide payments to schools to ensure returnee attendance, can play a valuable role in the construction of a skills basis for future stages of the economic transition which is currently underway. The irrelevance of formal education to current economic conditions, however, suggests the need for instruction in trades which can take advantage of the needs of a less developed environment, although expansion of employment opportunities for graduates of vocational courses is likely to be constrained by the lack of financial capital in Karamoja and, consequently, its inhabitants' inability to purchase services offered by skilled young people.

The absence of interventions focused on developing the ability of the returnees – and other members of their communities – to contribute to the establishment of a new basis for the livelihoods of the Karimojong is in line with inadequate focus on economic assistance in CAAFAG programming. Unlike the beneficiaries of many initiatives intended to support former child soldiers and other children affected by conflict, however, Bokora migrants have no access to psychological and psychosocial services. While their experiences are less traumatic than those of the CAAFAG, Karimojong returnees are affected by multiple painful incidents at all stages of the migration and return process: from the pre-migration conditions in their

homes, to hardships and distress which they face during migration, to negative experiences caused by inadequate organization and oversight of return initiatives. Because assistance currently offered to the returnees is unlikely to contribute to substantial improvement of the living conditions which they experienced before migration, the prospects of elimination of these multiple forms of distress are limited.

Preservation of Karimojong society following the destruction of its historical economic foundations can be attributed largely to the firmly entrenched code of behaviour which promotes social harmony, solidarity and intracommunal cooperation. It ensures the warm welcome received by most former child migrants upon return to their *njireria* and provides a framework which can facilitate their subsequent reintegration. The support found by the children within their communities does not, however, eliminate the value of professional psychological and psychosocial assistance methods developed to enable the returnees to successfully deal with their negative experiences. In addition, ill-conceived and badly implemented reintegration programming threatens to undermine the cohesiveness of Bokora communities and, consequently, their ability to provide the returnees with harmonious and welcoming surroundings.

Unlike in areas which receive CAAFAG, where extensive consultations are held with communities and local leaders to help them to understand the children's experiences and the important role which positive attitudes towards the returnees can play in overcoming trauma, reintegration programming in Karamoja has been focused exclusively on individual children and the limited assistance which they receive. Community members are not informed of the children's arrival, their concerns about the return are not addressed, and no efforts are made to assist them in the creation of a living environment which would no longer be conducive to child migration. Instead, their exclusion from receipt of assistance increases the commonly held perception of marginalization, neglect and lack of interest in the plight of the Karimojong, creates resentment towards the returnees and – in the context of poverty and insecurity – may ultimately lead to deterioration of intracommunal relations.

Furthermore, restriction of assistance to returnees and their families creates perverse incentives to migrate for other children. Poorer households are more likely to be involved in child migration but, because there is little intracommunal asset and income inequality among the Bokora, most of them are exposed to the factors which lead to migration. Assistance recipients are, therefore, effectively chosen randomly: their economic and social status is unlikely to be much different than that of other inhabitants of their area. Such discrimination is likely to not only undermine community cohesiveness and promote intracommunal conflicts, but also encourage children or their parents to participate in migration in hopes that their participation in the phenomenon will result both in successful acquirement of food or money in their destination, and in inclusion in a reintegration programme (and, consequently, receipt of assistance):

When they brought posho and beans, it helped community members because they could borrow from families whose children had migrated. Many families started sending children to town because they also wanted to benefit from food assistance.

(Focus group discussion participant from Matany Sub-county)

Some people are very annoyed because we got free things. Others say that if they had sent their children away, they would have also got free things. Some people are jealous because they do not have such items in their families.

(Parent from Lopeei Sub-county)

The failure of currently offered forms of assistance to address the needs of the returnees, their families and communities and their paradoxical encouragement of child migration demonstrates the necessity of long-term, comprehensive approaches which target entire communities, establish close relationships with them and – harnessing the power of local institutions (primarily elders) and popular participation – help them to deal with the distress and trauma caused by factors present in their communities or

encountered by children during their migration, and to begin the construction of a new foundation of their livelihoods. In the absence of such programming, the lives of the returnees and those close to them remain exposed the effects of the shocks which have affected their homeland in recent decades.

The aftermath: the children's lives after return

Following return, the former Bokora child migrants face the daunting task of reestablishing their place in communities where they experienced hardships which led to their migration and, consequently, to further suffering in Kampala and other destinations. They return to places which are both their homes – to which they are welcomed by their families, friends and other community members – and inhospitable, insecure locations which form exceedingly unsuitable environments for the upbringing of young people. The nature of their multifaceted experiences is best expressed by the voices of the returnees – as well as their families and neighbours – themselves.

Given the lack of appreciable positive impact of return initiatives and their assistance components, the returnees' relationships with their families and communities are crucial to their wellbeing. Most research participants agree that the love and respect which the children receive from their parents enhances the quality of their lives. Parents are aware of the privations which their offspring experienced before return and their anxiety about the prospect of remigration often leads to better treatment than prior to migration:

There is love in the family. I love her because I am afraid that she may leave again. I go to the bush every day and I collect vegetables and wild fruits, so that she does not sleep hungry and follow her sisters in Kampala.

(Parent from Lopeei Sub-county)

My daughter has promised never to go back again. We work and look for elejilej together, so that we can get food. She is a good girl these

days because she collects firewood and fetches water. She has learnt that staying in a town is very expensive.

(Parent from Lokopo Sub-county)

Due to their changed understanding of the children's needs, parents are likely to demand less labour, opening the possibility of happier and more fulfilling lives for the returnees, who now have time to play with their peers and – if their parents can afford it (or if their fees have been paid by the returning organization, which happens occasionally) – attend school. In some cases, the alteration of intergenerational dynamics enables the family to address some of the factors which contributed to migration, such as mistreatment:

My parents love me now because I came back home, but before I migrated they used to beat me whenever I made a mistake.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

If I started beating the boy, he would run away. This is why I only advise him on proper behaviour. Our relationship is good because he does what I tell him to.

(Parent from Lorengechora Sub-county)

Good family relationships are often reflected by broader social structures which further facilitate the returnees' reintegration:

People in the community are very kind to me and advise me not to leave again. They say that they were worried about me when I was away.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

A minority of community members are concerned about their neighbours' children's participation in a phenomenon which they consider to be shaming the Bokora and the Karimojong, but interactions with the returnees – who share with them their experiences – usually allows for formation of more harmonious relations over time:

We thought that they were bad children who did not respect their parents, but they now help their parents in cultivation.

(Focus group discussion participant from Lokopo Sub-county)

Because they have not migrated again, our opinion of them has changed. We now love them and have trust in them.

(Focus group discussion participant from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

The returnees can also depend on the support of their peers, who provide a trusted social circle which can encourage discussion of the traumatic experiences of different stages of the migration and return process and, ultimately, help to deal with their psychological impact.

The presence of strong social structures which help the returnees to reintegrate in their homes does not, however, address the key challenges faced by Bokora communities.

Ever since the child came back we have been eating one meal per day.

When I was in Kampala I could eat twice a day.

(Parent from Lopeei Sub-county)

Life is very difficult in Karamoja. I eat residue from ekwete as my only meal every day because my mother cannot afford to buy food for the family.

(Returnee from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

I am responsible for eight younger siblings. We sleep hungry at least three times a week because we cannot afford to buy food.

(Returnee from Ngoleriet Sub-county)

I want to go to school, but there is no one who can pay my fees.

(Returnee from Lokopo Sub-county)

The material challenges which the returnees continue to face affect their emotional wellbeing and augment psychological distress brought about by earlier experiences:

I am afraid that there will be no food in the future.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

Sometimes I cry when there is no food at home and my children are sleeping hungry.

(Parent from Lokopo Sub-county)

I am afraid that I will not finish school because my parents cannot afford to pay for it.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

The returnees continue to face hunger and other forms of material poverty. Despite regularly expressed desire to obtain formal education, very few of them attend school. The combination of painful experiences before, during and after the migration and return process further aggravates their illbeing. In this context, it is remarkable (despite the hardships of migration) that nearly all research participants are more satisfied with life in Karamoja than in their migration destinations:

Life at home is better than in towns. It is not good to love a place which is not yours because in a town you do not have relatives who can help you.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

Life is better at home because you are with your parents.

(Returnee from Lopeei Sub-county)

Home is good because there is no begging here, like in Kampala.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

Their voices indicate the continued relevance of traditional behavioural norms to contemporary Karimojong existence. They are suspicious of the modern, monetized economy which they encounter in other parts of Uganda and express preference for historically practiced forms of production which are rooted in cooperation and mutual assistance and give the term 'home' (*ere*) its proper meaning:

Home is better. You do not have to pay rent and buy food. In Mbale, you need money for everything. Here, I do not sleep hungry because I can go to the neighbours to eat.

(Returnee from Lokopo Sub-county)

Here, we grow our own food, while in Kampala you have to go to the street and beg for food.

(Returnee from Matany Sub-county)

In present conditions, both home and migration destinations are ultimately associated with suffering. Although good familial relationships and community cohesiveness help the returnees to deal with their painful memories, they do not eliminate the factors which led to their migration. Despite the difficulty of migration, the constant reality of hardship and distress which they experience in Karamoja continues to encourage migration, including among those children who have been returned as part of reintegration and resettlement initiatives:

Many of the children who were returned have gone to Teso, while those who liked Kampala have gone back there.

(Focus group participant from Lopeei Sub-county)

They returned nearly all children from this community, but now none of them are here because they went back when they saw that their parents had no food in their homes.

(Focus group participant from Lopeei Sub-county)

Many children were returned, but some have already left again because they had no money for school.

(Focus group participant from Matany Sub-county)

Few Bokora returnees express desire to remigrate, but the conditions which they encounter at home often leave them with little choice. The popularity of remigration is, therefore, ultimately the result of continuous inability of external actors – the government, United Nations agencies and NGOs – to offer the people of Karamoja alternative ways to overcome the multiple upsets which the region has experienced in recent past.

Conclusion

The migration of Bokora children and their subsequent return to Karamoja form a complex, prolonged process which has long-lasting and multifaceted ramifications for the lives of the migrants, their families and communities. As an adaptation of historical Karimojong mobility behaviour to radically changed circumstances, it is a result of the natural, political and socioeconomic shocks which have affected Karamoja during the course of the twentieth century, and of the consequent erosion of the traditional agropastoral basis of Karimojong livelihoods. The choice of migration as a survival strategy – which is initiated by children or their parents in response to hunger; inability to attend school and fulfil their labour obligations; work beyond the children’s physical capabilities and unsuitable for their age; insecurity; mistreatment; and other challenges which they face in their communities – reflects the lack of alternative opportunities for Bokora children. Its desperation is demonstrated by the limited prospect of success (defined as return with food or money) and distressing experiences of the migrants in their destinations, particularly in urban areas, where the children are likely to miss meals, lack adequate shelter and engage in economic behaviour which ensures their inferior social position and, consequently, exposes them to marginalization, stigmatization and abuse in host communities.

Return initiatives’ focus on urban migrants is due chiefly to the visibility of young Bokora on the streets of Kampala (as well as some smaller Ugandan towns), but it can be justified by the relatively harsher nature of their migration experiences compared to their peers who move to rural areas. Return programming has, however, been characterized by lack of vision, inadequate planning and poor management. Many of its intended beneficiaries are returned forcibly and exposed to further mistreatment during the return process.

Return programming has generally incorporated provision of assistance, but it has been highly inconsistent. Its allocation and delivery tend to be

unsystematic and disorganized. Lack of consideration of the long-term needs of returnees, their families and communities, as well as insufficient funding, have constrained return programmes' potential to ensure lasting impacts of assistance, which has been mostly limited to inexpensive, one-off, short-term and, ultimately, ineffective or counterproductive interventions.

The failure of currently offered forms of assistance to address the needs of the returnees, their families and communities and their paradoxical encouragement of child migration demonstrates the necessity of long-term, comprehensive approaches which target entire communities, establish close relationships with them and – harnessing the power of local institutions (primarily elders) and popular participation – help them to deal with the distress and trauma caused by factors present in their communities or encountered by children during their migration, and to begin the construction of a new foundation of their livelihoods. In the absence of such programming, the lives of the returnees and those close to them remain exposed the effects of the shocks which have befallen their homeland in recent decades.

Appendix I: Research Sites

Lotop, Nakwamoru Parish, Lopeei Sub-county, Napak District, 24th July 2012 and 2nd August 2012.

Lorengelup, Nakwamoru Parish, Lopeei Sub-county, Napak District, 25th July 2012 and 3rd August 2012.

Lomuria, Nakwamoru Parish, Lopeei Sub-county, Napak District, 26th July 2012 and 2nd August 2012.

Kaleese, Lokudumo Parish, Lopeei Sub-county, Napak District, 27th July 2012 and 2nd August 2012.

Lokitela, Lokupoi Parish, Matany Sub-county, Napak District, 6th August 2012 and 10th August 2012.

Kogete, Lokupoi Parish, Matany Sub-county, Napak District, 7th August 2012 and 10th August 2012.

Loopongo, Lokali Parish, Matany Sub-county, Napak District, 8th August 2012 and 10th August 2012.

Morualoyete, Lokali Parish, Matany Sub-county, Napak District, 17th August 2012 and 17th August 2012.

Lomariamong, Lokupoi Parish, Matany Sub-county, Napak District, 21st August 2012.

Namakwae, Nawoikorot Parish, Ngolereit Sub-county, Napak District, 23rd August 2012 and 28th August 2012.

Kangole Chin, Nawoikorot Parish, Ngolereit Sub-county, Napak District, 24th August 2012 and 28th August 2012.

Koyanga, Nawoikorot Parish, Ngolereit Sub-county, Napak District, 27th August 2012 and 28th August 2012.

Nadipal, Akalale Parish, Lokopo Sub-county, Napak District, 6th September 2012 and 11th September 2012.

Lokarujak, Longalom Parish, Lokopo Sub-county, Napak District, 7th September 2012 and 11th September 2012.

Kayepath, Kayepath Parish, Lokopo Sub-county, Napak District, 10th September 2012 and 11th September 2012.

Lokerui, Kobulin Parish, Lorengechora Sub-county, Napak District, 18th September 2012 and 25th September 2012.

Loyep Village, Lomaratoit Parish, Iriiri Sub-county, Napak District, 20th September 2012 and 25th September 2012.

Nakwakwae, Kokipurat Parish, Lorengechora Sub-county, Napak District, 21st September 2012 and 1st October 2012.

Kopopua, Kopopua Parish, Lorengechora Sub-county, Napak District, 24th September 2012 and 25th September 2012.

Nabata, Apeitolim Parish, Lokopo Sub-county, Napak District, 27th September 2012.

Appendix II: Research Instrument

I. Interviews with former migrants

1.
 - 1.1. How old are you?
 - 1.2. Where did you migrate?
 - 1.3. How much time did you spend there?
2.
 - 2.1. Why did you decide to migrate?
 - 2.2. Did you make the decision yourself, or were you asked to migrate by your parents/guardians/other people?
 - 2.3. Were you mistreated at home in any way before you migrated? If so, did this mistreatment contribute to the decision to migrate?
3.
 - 3.1. Describe your experiences of migration.
 - 3.2. Did you work? If so, what exactly did you do?
 - 3.3. Did you lack food or shelter?
 - 3.4. Were you mistreated in any way? If so, by whom?
4.
 - 4.1. When did you come back/resettle?
 - 4.2. How did you come back/resettle? Did you decide to come back yourself, or was your return organized?
 - 4.3. If it was not organized, why did you decide to come back?
 - 4.4. If it was organized, did you want to be returned, or was it done against your will? Were you taken to Kamparingisa?
 - 4.5. Would you have stayed in the place to which you migrated if you could?
5.
 - 5.1. Describe your experiences of return.
 - 5.2. Were you mistreated in any way? If so, by whom?
 - 5.3. Did you lack food or shelter at any point during the return process?
 - 5.4. Were you allowed to play?
 - 5.5. Were you able to wash, given clean clothes?
 - 5.6. Were you taught anything?

6.
 - 6.1. When you came back to Karamoja, did you go straight to your home community/resettlement site, or did you stop at other places, for example at a reception centre for former child migrants?
 - 6.2. Were you given the option to choose either your home community or resettlement site? If so, why did you choose the place to which you moved?
7.
 - 7.1. Describe your experiences in the first days after you were returned to your home community/resettled.
 - 7.2. Were you afraid of what might happen in the future?
 - 7.3. Were you afraid of any people there?
 - 7.4. How did the people there react to your arrival?
 - 7.5. If you returned to your home community, did your family members or other community members welcome you?
 - 7.6. Was there any difference between the reaction of your family and the reaction of other community members?
8.
 - 8.1. If you have returned to your home community, has the fact that you migrated changed your relationship with your family members? If so, how and why has it changed?
 - 8.2. Do family members treat you well? If not, what do they do and why? Is this because you migrated?
9. Do community members treat you well? If not, what do they do and why?
10.
 - 10.1. If your return was unorganized, did you come back with money, food or other items for your family?
 - 10.2. If it was organized, did the organization which brought you back give you any assistance?
 - 10.3. Did this assistance include items which you brought home, or direct assistance to your parents or community?
 - 10.4. Do you think that the items which you brought or the assistance which was given to you had an impact on the reaction of your family or community members to your arrival?

11.
 - 11.1. If you received some assistance, are you happy with it? If not, why not?
 - 11.2. Has the organization contacted you since return?
12. Is the fact that you migrated important to your friends and other peers in the community? For example, do they admire you, or make fun of you because of it?
13. Have you been going to school since you returned? If not, why?
14.
 - 14.1. Were the reasons because of which you migrated – for example hunger, lack of work, or mistreatment – addressed when you came back to Karamoja? Have you had to deal with any of them since your return?
 - 14.2. If your return was organized, did you tell or were you asked by the staff of the organization which returned you about these reasons? Did they do anything about it?
15. What difficulties have you experienced since migrating? For example, have you had nightmares about the time when you migrated? have you been afraid of your family members or people in your community? have you been afraid of the future? have you ever been hungry since you returned? do you have your own, comfortable place to sleep?
16. If you have moved to a resettlement site, would you rather return to your home community? If so, why?
17. What do you think about the time when you were away? Do you think that life was better here or there? Why do you think so?
18.
 - 18.1. Have you migrated again since you came back? If so, how many times have you migrated?
 - 18.2. Why did you migrate again after return?
19. Do you want to migrate again? Why?
20. Even if you do not want to migrate again, do you think you would do it if your situation changed? If so, in what ways would your situation have to change?

II. Interviews with parents or guardians

1.
 - 1.1. Would you describe your family as more vulnerable than others?
 - 1.2. Do you have fewer cattle or other assets than other families?
 - 1.3. Is this a female-headed household?
2. If you are a guardian, not a parent, why and how did you become one?
3.
 - 3.1. Why do you think did the interviewed child migrate?
 - 3.2. Did you instruct her to leave, support the decision which she made, or did she run away?
4.
 - 4.1. Was the interviewed child your only child who migrated?
 - 4.2. If so, why did only she leave?
 - 4.3. If not, have other children remained in the places to which they migrated, or have they returned as well?
 - 4.4. If they returned, did they do so spontaneously, or was their return organized?
 - 4.5. Have any of these children subsequently migrated again? If so, why did they do so?
5.
 - 5.1. Did you want the child to come back, or do you think it would have been better if she had stayed in the place to which she had migrated?
 - 5.2. How did you react when the child returned/when you found out that she would be returning? For example, were you happy to see her, or did you worry about having to provide food for her?
6. If the child's return was organized, do you think it is right that the child was returned? If not, why? For example, was the child brought back to Karamoja against her or your will?
7.
 - 7.1. If the child's return was organized, did the organization responsible for return contact you? If so, what did they do?
 - 7.2. Did they ask you if you wanted to receive the migrant?

- 7.3. Did they ask you if you needed assistance in order to provide food and other necessities to the child?
8. If the child's return was organized, did the organization bring the child to your *ere*, did the child come on her own, or did you have to travel in order to receive the child?
9.
 - 9.1. If the child's return was organized, did the organization provide you with any assistance? If so, what was this assistance?
 - 9.2. Did you find it useful?
 - 9.3. Do you think it was enough to meet your needs?
 - 9.4. If not, why do you think that the organization should have provided more assistance?
 - 9.5. What further assistance did you require?
 - 9.6. Did the assistance which you receive contribute to your reaction to the child's return?
10.
 - 10.1. If the child's return was organized, what contact, if any, have you had with the responsible organization since return?
 - 10.2. Are you happy with it, or do you think that there should have been more contact? If the latter, why do you think so?
11. When the child returned, how did you welcome her?
12.
 - 12.1. What impact, if any, has the child's return had on your family? For example, has there been conflict within the family because of the return?
 - 12.2. Do you think that the causes of the child's migration have been addressed?
13.
 - 13.1. Do you think that migration has had any impact on your relationship with the child?
 - 13.2. Do you think of her or treat her differently to your other children? If so, why?
14. Do you think that migration, and the child's return, has had any impact on your relationship with your community? For example, if you received

assistance from the organization responsible for return, has it affected the ways in which other community members treat you or your child?

15. Have you experienced any material or psychological challenges because of the child's return? For example, have you been hungry because you cannot afford to feed all family members? have you been worried about the child's safety?
16. Considering your experiences since the child's return, are you happy that the child is with you, or would you prefer if she had not returned?
17.
 - 17.1. Would you like the child, or your other children, to migrate again? If so, why?
 - 17.2. Even if you do not want it, do you think that they may migrate in the future? If so, why?

III. Focus group discussions

1.
 - 1.1. Do many children in this community migrate outside Karamoja?
 - 1.2. How many of them (nearly all/most/a minority/nearly none) have returned?
 - 1.3. Have more children returned spontaneously, or has return usually been organized?
(Ignore this question if the community is a resettlement site.)
2. Were the community or its leaders (LC1, elders) consulted by the organization(s) responsible for the return? If so, what happened?
3.
 - 3.1. Was the community well prepared to receive returned/resettled children?
 - 3.2. If the return was organized, did the organization(s) support the community in any way?
4. What did you think of returned/resettled children at the time?
5. Has your opinion changed now?
- 6.

- 6.1. Has the fact that (some) returned children or their families received assistance following return contribute to your opinion?
- 6.2. Has this assistance had any other impacts on the community?
7. Has return changed the relationship between the child and her family and community members?
8. Have families whose children returned experienced difficulties because of the return? For example, has it been more difficult for them to find food, or have they experienced domestic disputes?
9.
 - 9.1. Would you like the returned/resettled children to migrate again?
 - 9.2. Even if you do not want it to happen, do you think more children may migrate? If so, why do you think would they do so?

Appendix III: Informed Consent Script for Adult Research Participants

Introduction

Hello, my name is Lokiru Denis and I am working with the International Organization for Migration on a research project intended to help us to understand better the experiences of former Karimojong child migrants who have returned to their communities or been resettled in other communities. If you agree to take part in this research project, we will be asking you questions about the Karimojong child migration, experiences of the affected children, their families, and the whole community, and your opinions about the return or resettlement of the children.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. You are under no obligation to participate, but your responses will help us to understand the experiences of former migrants, their families, and your community. If you have any questions later, you can contact me on 0777754363. In addition, if you have any issues with the research project or the way in which it was conducted, you can contact the researcher responsible for the project, Karol Czuba, on 0781057444, or the officer in charge of the Moroto office of the International Organization for Migration, Muwonge Maxie, on 0772707857.

Confidentiality

Participation in the study is anonymous. Your name is collected for administrative purposes only and will not be linked in any way to the information which you provide. You will not be identified in any report or publication of this study or its results. Yours personal details will not be shared with any individual or organization. This consent form will be the only form

with your name. The interview information, which will only have a study number on it, will be stored separately from your consent form. In addition, you may refuse to answer any questions or ask that the interview be stopped at any time.

Duration

The expected duration of the interview or focus group discussion is between 1.5-2 hours. This time will vary according to respondent and may be adjusted.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to you (the person taking part in the survey). However, the knowledge you share with us will help us better understand the needs of former child migrants, their families, and communities.

Appendix IV: Assent Script for Child Research Participants

Hello, my name is Lokiru Denis and I am working with the International Organization for Migration (IOM). We are asking you to be in a research study. Research is a way to ask questions and test new ideas. Research helps us to learn new things. We are working on a research project to learn about the experiences of children like you who have come back to their home communities or other communities from other parts of Uganda. Being in research is your choice. You can say yes or no. Whatever you decide is OK. If you want to participate, we will ask you to answer some questions about you and your experiences. You will only be asked to participate one time, and it should not take more than one hour. In addition, you may refuse to answer any questions or ask that the interview be stopped at any time.

What we learn in this project will not help you now. When we finish the research, we hope to know more about children who leave Karamoja. We may use this information in the future to make programs to help children in your community or in other communities.

None of the answers that you tell us will have your name on them, so they will be kept secret. We might share the answers that you give us with other people, but no one will know that they were your answers.

What we learn in this project will not help you now. When we finish the research, we hope to know more about children who leave Karamoja. We may use this information in the future to make programs to help children in your community or in other communities.

None of the answers that you tell us will have your name on them, so they will be kept secret. We might share the answers that you give us with other people, but no one will know that they were your answers.

Take the time you need to make your choice. Ask us any questions you have. You can ask questions at any time during the interview.

Appendix V: Consent/Assent Form

Interview Number: _____

Participant's Name: _____

Parent or Guardian's Name (if applicable): _____

Community: _____

I (the interviewer) have read the above information to the interviewee (and, if applicable, his or her parent or guardian) who has agreed to be interviewed for the purposes of this study, and to allow the research team to use data gathered in this study for research publication and for future organization of programmes in Karamoja.

Interviewer's name: _____

Interviewer's signature: _____ Date: _____

Bibliography

Akabwai, Darlington, and Priscillar E. Ateyo, 'The Scramble for Cattle, Power and Guns in Karamoja' (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2007).

Andiema, Rachel, Ton Dietz, and Albino Kotomei, 'Participatory Evaluation of Development Interventions for Poverty Alleviation Among (Former) Pastoralists in West Pokot, Kenya' (Amsterdam: Pokot Development Research Group AGIDS/CERES Amsterdam Research Institute for Global Issues and Development Studies/ Research School for Resource Studies for Development, 2003).

Ansell, Nicola, and Lorraine van Blerk, 'Children's Migration as a Household/Family Strategy: Coping with AIDS in Lesotho and Malawi', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30 (2004), 429–432.

Archambault, Caroline S., Joost de Laat, and Eliya Msiyaphazi Zulu, 'Urban Services and Child Migration to the Slums of Nairobi', *World Development*, xx (2012).

Barratt, Caroline, Martin Mbonye, and Janet Seeley, 'Between Town and Country: Shifting Identity and Migrant Youth in Uganda', *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 50 (2012), 201–223.

Barton, David, Nick Meadows, and John Morton, *Drought Losses, Pastoral Saving and Banking: A Review* (Natural Resources Institute, 2001).

Bascom, Johnathan B., 'Border Pastoralism in Eastern Sudan', *Geographical Review*, 80 (1990), 416–430.

Bassi, Marco, 'The Politics of Space in Borana Oromo, Ethiopia: Demographics, Elections, Identity and Customary Institutions', *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 4 (2010), 221–246.

- Behnke, Roy H., 'Production Rationales: The Commercialization of Subsistence Pastoralism', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (1982).
- Berhanu, Wassie, and Bichaka Fayissa, 'Analysis of the Household Economy and Expenditure Patterns of a Traditional Pastoralist Society in Southern' (Middle Tennessee State University, 2010).
- Bernstein, Henry, 'Capitalism and Moral Economy: Land Questions in Sub-Saharan Africa' (London, United Kingdom: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 2007).
- Bevan, James, *Crisis in Karamoja: Armed Violence and the Failure of Disarmament in Uganda's Most Deprived Region* (Geneva, Switzerland: Small Arms Survey, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2008).
- Bilger, Veronika, and Albert Kraler, 'Introduction: African Migrations. Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Dynamics', *Wiener Zeitschrift für kritische Afrikastudien*, 8 (2005), 5–21.
- van Blerk, Lorraine, 'Poverty, Migration and Sex Work: Youth Transitions in Ethiopia', *Area*, 40 (2008), 245–253.
- Bollig, Michael, 'Staging Social Structures: Ritual and Social Organisation in an Egalitarian Society. The Pastoral Pokot of Northern Kenya', *Ethnos*, 65 (2000), 341–365.
- Brewer, John, and Albert Hunter, *Multimethod Research: A Synthesis of Styles* (Newbury Park, California, United States: SAGE Publications, 1989).
- Carr-Hill, Roy, and Edwina Peart, *The Education of Nomadic Peoples in East Africa, Production* (African Development Bank).

Chatty, Dawn, 'Review Article: Mobile Peoples: Pastoralists and Herders at the Beginning of the 21st Century' (Oxford, United Kingdom: University of Oxford).

Cisternino, Mario, 'How the Karimojong Pastoralists Manage Their Territory: The Ecological Circle of the Pastoralists and the Social Structure Holding It Together', in *Sustainability in Karamoja? Rethinking the Terms of Global Sustainability in a Crisis Region of Africa*, ed. by David Knaute and Sacha Kagan (Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2009), pp. 367–377.

---, 'Karamoja: The Human Zoo. The History of Planning for Karamoja with Some Tentative Counterplanning' (University of Wales, Swansea, 1979).

Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN), *9th Regional Report on the Karamoja Cluster (Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda)* (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, 2007).

Czuba, Karol, 'Income Generating Activities and Savings Behaviour of Adolescent Girls and Young Women in Karamoja' (Kampala, Uganda: BRAC, 2012).

Desta, Solomon, and D. Layne Coppock, 'Pastoralism Under Pressure: Tracking System Change in Southern Ethiopia', *Human Ecology*, 32 (2004), 465–486.

Development Partners, 'Briefing Note for the Policy Dialogue on Pastoralism and Agricultural Production Systems in Karamoja' (Kampala, Uganda, 2010).

Dyson-Hudson, Neville, *Karimojong Politics* (London, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1966).

---, 'The Karimojong Age System', *Ethnology*, 2 (1963), 353–401.

- Eaton, Dave, 'The Business of Peace: Raiding and Peace Work Along the Kenya-Uganda Border (Part I)', *African Affairs*, 107 (2008), 89–110.
- , 'The Business of Peace: Raiding and Peace Work Along the Kenya-Uganda Border (Part II)', *African Affairs*, 107 (2008), 243–259.
- , 'The Rise of the "Traider": The Commercialization of Raiding in Karamoja', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 106–122.
- Egemi, Omer A., 'Dryland Pastoralism Among the Northern Bisharien of the Red Sea Hills, Sudan', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa).
- Ekaya, W. N., 'The Shift from Mobile Pastoralism to Sedentary Crop-Livestock Farming in the Drylands of Eastern Africa: Some Issues and Challenges for Research', in *African Crop Science Conference Proceedings*, 2005, pp. 1513–1519.
- Ezaga, O P, *Markets for Livestock and Food Crops in Karamoja Subregion* (European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).
- Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), *Conflict Early Warning and Migration of Resource Based Conflicts in the Greater Horn of Africa: Conflict Baseline Study Report in Karamajong Cluster of Kenya and Uganda* (Kampala, Uganda: USAID, 2005).
- Fernandez-Gimenez, Maria E., and Sonya Le Febre, 'Mobility in Pastoral Systems: Dynamic Flux or Downward Trend?', *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13 (2006), 341–362.
- Forstater, Mathew, 'Bones for Sale: "Development", Environment and Food Security in East Africa', *Review of Political Economy*, 14 (2002), 47–67.

- Fratkin, Elliot, 'East African Pastoralism in Transition: Maasai, Boran, and Rendille Cases', *African Studies Review*, 44 (2001), 1–25.
- Fratkin, Elliot, Eric Abella Roth, and Martha A. Nathan, 'Pastoral Sedentarization and Its Effects on Children's Diet, Health, and Growth Among Rendille of Northern Kenya', *Human Ecology*, 32 (2004), 531–559.
- Gachathi, Francis N., and Siri Eriksen, 'Gums and Resins: The Potential for Supporting Sustainable Adaptation in Kenya's Drylands', *Climate and Development*, 3 (2011), 59–70.
- Gackle, Joel Wesley, Grace Lolem, and Martin Patrick Kabanda, *Karamojong Street Children and Adults in Kampala, Uganda: A Situational Analysis Investigating the Root Causes, Issues Faced, and Current Responses* (Hadlow, Kent, United Kingdom: Oasis International, 2005).
- Gartrell, Beverly, 'Searching for "The Roots of Famine": The Case of Karamoja', *Review of African Political Economy*, 33 (1985), 102–109.
- George, Alexander, and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States, 2005).
- Gourlay, Ken A., 'Trees and Anthills: Songs of Karimojong Women's Groups', *African Music*, 4 (1970), 114–121.
- Gray, Sandra J., 'A Memory of Loss: Ecological Politics, Local History, and the Evolution of Karimojong Violence', *Human Organization*, 59 (2000), 401–418.
- , "'Someone Dies in Your Lap": Structural, Ecological and Political Effects on Child and Maternal Health Care Decisions, Moroto District, Uganda, 2004', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 44–71.

Gray, Sandra J., Mary B. Sundal, Brandi Wiebusch, Michael A. Little, Paul W. Leslie, and Ivy L. Pike, 'Cattle Raiding , Cultural Survival , and Adaptability of East African Pastoralists', *Current Anthropology*, 44 (2003), 3–30.

Greenough, Karen, 'Becoming Mobile Pastoralists: Desedentarization Among the Ful'be of Tanout, Niger' (University of Kentucky, 2006)
<[http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~anthro/courses/5011/Greenough NSF Prop.doc](http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~anthro/courses/5011/Greenough%20NSF%20Prop.doc)> [accessed 15 November 2011].

Guba, Egon G., 'Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries', *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29 (1981), 75–91.

Gulliver, P. H., 'The Age-Set Organization of the Jie Tribe', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 83 (1953), 147–168.

---, *The Family Herds. A Study of Two Pastoral Tribes in East Africa: The Jie and Turkana* (London, United Kingdom: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1972).

---, 'The Karamajong Cluster', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 22 (1952), 1–22.

Hashim, Iman M., 'Exploring the Linkages Between Children's Independent Migration and Education: Evidence from Ghana' (Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, 2005).

Heald, Suzette, 'Agricultural Intensification and the Decline of Pastoralism: A Case Study from Kenya', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 69 (1999), 213–237.

Helland, Johann, 'Institutional Erosion in the Drylands: The Case of the Borana Pastoralists', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abdel Ghaffar M.

- Ahmed (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, 2000).
- Hodgson, Dorothy L., 'Pastoralism, Patriarchy and History: Changing Gender Relations Among Maasai in Tanganyika', *The Journal of African History*, 40 (1999), 41–65.
- , 'Taking Stock: State Control, Ethnic Identity and Pastoralist Development in Tanganyika, 1948-1958', *Journal of African History*, 41 (2000), 55–78.
- Hogg, Richard, 'NGOs, Pastoralists and the Myth of Community', *Nomadic Peoples*, 30 (1992), 122–146.
- , 'The New Pastoralism: Poverty and Dependency in Northern Kenya', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 56 (1986), 319–333.
- Homewood, K., Ernestina Coast, S. Kiruswa, M. Thompson, and P. Trench, 'Maasai Pastoralists: Diversification and Poverty' (London, United Kingdom: London School of Economics and Political Science, 2006).
- Human Rights Watch, "*Get the Gun!*": *Human Rights Violations by Uganda's National Army in Law Enforcement Operations in Karamoja Region* (New York, New York, United States: Human Rights Watch, 2007).
- International Organization for Migration, *Community Based Vulnerability Assessment: The Impact of Raids on Communities* (Kampala, Uganda: International Organization for Migration, 2010).
- , 'Discussion Paper: Reducing Insecurity Through Self Reliance' (Kampala, Uganda: International Organization for Migration, 2010).
- , *The Karamoja Community Stabilization and Sustainability Manual* (Kampala, Uganda: International Organization for Migration, 2010).
- , *The IOM Handbook on Direct Assistance for Victims of Trafficking* (Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Migration, 2007)

- Irish Aid, *Chronic Poverty and Vulnerability in Karamoja: Synopsis of Findings, Recommendations and Conclusions* (Kampala: Irish Aid, 2007).
- Iversen, Vegard, 'Autonomy in Child Labor Migrants', *World Development*, 30 (2002), 817–834.
- Jabs, Lorelle, 'Where Two Elephants Meet, the Grass Suffers: A Case Study of Intractable Conflict in Karamoja, Uganda', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50 (2007), 1498–1519.
- Johnson, Douglas A., Dennis P. Sheehy, Daniel Miller, and Daalkhaijav Damiran, 'Mongolian Rangelands in Transition', *Sécheresse*, 17 (2006), 133–141.
- KWG, *Briefing Note for the Policy Dialogue on Pastoralism and Agricultural Production Systems in Karamoja* (KWG, 2010).
- Kaduuli, Stephen, *"Forced Migration" in Karamoja, Uganda* (Kampala, Uganda: Africa Leadership Institute, 2008).
- Kasirye, Rogers, *Rapid Assessment Report in Trafficking of Children into Worst Forms of Child Labour, Including Child Soldiers in Uganda* (Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization, 2007).
- Kizito, Agan, Mary Lilly Akongo, Thomas Angiroi, Joyce Emai, Naputaria Logira, Xavier Lokuda, and others, *Strength, Creativity and Livelihoods of Karimojong Youth* (Jinja, Uganda: Restless Development, 2011).
- Knaute, David, 'A Synthesis of Major Publications on the Karamoja Region of Uganda, Using the Nine Spheres of the Syndrome Approach as a Framework', in *Sustainability in Karamoja? Rethinking the Terms of Global Sustainability in a Crisis Region of Africa*, ed. by David Knaute and Sacha Kagan (Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2009), pp. 19–142.

- , 'Rethinking Sustainability in Pastoralist Areas of East Africa', in *Sustainability in Karamoja? Rethinking the Terms of Global Sustainability in a Crisis Region of Africa*, ed. by David Knaute and Sacha Kagan (Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2009), pp. 1–15.
- Knighton, Ben, 'Belief in Guns and Warlords: Freeing Karamojong Identity from Africanist Theory', *African Identities*, 4 (2006), 269–286.
- , 'Can Notions of Common Property and the Common Good Survive? The Consequences of Classical Economics for Karamojong Nomadic Pastoralists', in *Sustainability in Karamoja? Rethinking the Terms of Global Sustainability in a Crisis Region of Africa*, ed. by David Knaute and Sacha Kagan (Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2009), pp. 384–419.
- , 'Christian Enculturation in Karamoja, Uganda' (University of Durham, 1990).
- , "'Disarmament': The End or Fulfillment of Cattle Raiding?", *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 123–146.
- , 'Eroding the Concept of Commons: A History of an Idea Inapplicable to Natural Resource Management by Karamojong Pastoralists', in *Pastoralism in the Horn of Africa: Surviving against all the odds (PENHA Conference, County Hall, London)*, 2005, pp. 1–28.
- , 'Historical Ethnography and the Collapse of Karamojong Culture: Premature Reports of Trends' (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford Centre for Mission Studies, 2002).
- , 'Of War-Leaders and Fire-Makers: A Rejoinder', *History in Africa*, 34 (2007), 411–420.
- , 'Orality in the Service of Karamojong Autonomy: Polity and Performance', *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, 18 (2006), 137–152.

---, 'The State as Raider Among the Karamojong: "Where There Are No Guns, They Use the Threat of Guns"', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 73 (2003), 427–455.

Konaka, Shinya, 'The Samburu Livestock Market in Northcentral Kenya' (Kyoto, Japan: Kyoto University, 1997).

Krätli, Saverio, *Educating Nomadic Herders Out of Poverty? Culture, Education and Pastoral Livelihood in Turkana and Karamoja* (Brighton, United Kingdom: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, 2001).

---, 'Karamoja with the Rest of "the Rest of Uganda"', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 3–23.

Kwankye, S. O., J. K. Anarfi, C. A. Tagoe, and A. Castaldo, 'Independent North-South Child Migration in Ghana: The Decision Making Process' (Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, 2009).

Kwankye, Stephen O., John K. Anarfi, Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe, and Adriana Castaldo, 'Coping Strategies of Independent Child Migrants from Northern Ghana to Southern Cities' (Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, 2007).

Levine, Simon, *A Food Security Analysis of Karamoja* (Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).

---, 'An Unromantic Look at Pastoralism in Karamoja: How Hard-hearted Economics Shows That Pastoral Systems Remain the Solution, and Not the Problem', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 147–153.

Lutaaya, William, and Christopher Lee, 'Household Vulnerability in Karamoja: Analysis of the KFSCS Dataset (2010)' (Kampala, Uganda: International Organization for Migration, 2012).

- Lynn, Stacy J, 'The Pastoral to Agro-Pastoral Transition in Tanzania: Human Adaptation in an Ecosystem Context', 2010.
- Mace, Ruth, David M. Anderson, Thomas Bierschenk, Lee Cronk, Ilse Koehler-Rollefson, William Lancaster, and others, 'Transitions Between Cultivation and Pastoralism in Sub-Saharan Africa', *Current Anthropology*, 34 (1993), 363–382.
- Mackinnon, John, and Ritva Reinikka, 'How Research Can Assist Policy: The Case of Economic Reforms in Uganda', *The World Bank Research Observer*, 17 (2002), 267–292.
- Magunda, M. K., *Study on Disaster Risk Management and Environment for the Karamoja Subregion* (European Commission Humanitarian Aid / Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).
- Mamdani, Mahmood, 'Karamoja: Colonial Roots of Famine in North-East Uganda', *Review of African Political Economy*, 25 (1982), 66–73.
- , 'The Colonial Roots of the Famine in Karamoja: A Rejoinder', *Review of African Political Economy*, 13 (1986), 85–92.
- , 'The Colonial Roots of the Famine in Karamoja: A Rejoinder', *Review of African Political Economy*, 36 (1986), 85–92.
- Mamdani, Mahmood, P. M. B. Kasoma, and A. B. Katende, *Karamoja: Ecology and History* (Kampala: Centre for Basic Research, 1992).
- Manger, Leif, 'East African Pastoralism and Underdevelopment: An Introduction', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, 2000).

- Mburu, Nene, *The Proliferation of Guns and Rustling in Karamoja and Turkana Districts: The Case for Appropriate Disarmament Strategies* (London, United Kingdom: King's College London, 2002).
- McGahey, Daniel J, 'Livestock Mobility and Animal Health Policy in Southern Africa: The Impact of Veterinary Cordon Fences on Pastoralists', *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice*, 1 (2011), 14–29.
- McKinney, Philip, *Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis* (Rome, Italy: World Food Programme, 2009).
- Mirzeler, Mustafa Kemal, 'The Importance of Being Honest: Verifying Citations, Rereading Historical Sources, and Establishing Authority in the Great Karamoja Debate', *History in Africa*, 34 (2007), 383–409.
- , 'The Tricksters of Karamoja', *History in Africa*, 34 (2007), 421–426.
- Mirzeler, Mustafa Kemal, and M. Crawford Young, 'Pastoral Politics in the Northeast Periphery in Uganda: AK-47 as Change Agent', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 38 (2000), 407–429.
- Miyoshi, Masao, 'Sites of Resistance in the Global Economy', *boundary 2*, 22 (1995), 61–84.
- Mkutu Agade, Kennedy, 'Complexities of Livestock Raiding in Karamoja', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 87–105.
- , 'Disarmament in Karamoja, Northern Uganda: Is This a Solution for Localised Violent Inter and Intra-Communal Conflict?', *The Round Table*, 97 (2008), 99–120.
- Mossman, Archie S., 'International Game Ranching Programs', *Journal of Animal Science*, 40 (1975), 993–999.
- Mubiru, D. N., *Climate Change and Adaptation Options in Karamoja* (European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).

- Munaabi, Gideon, and Enoch Mutabaazi, 'Karamoja: Resurrecting the Pen', *Uganda Pulse*, 2006
 <<http://www.ugpulse.com/articles/daily/Heritage.asp?about=Karamoja%3A+Resurrecting+the+Pen&ID=430>> [accessed 20 March 2011].
- Nalule, A.S., *Social Management of Rangelands and Settlement in Karamoja Subregion* (European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).
- Novelli, Bruno, 'Karimojong Traditional Religion: A Contribution' (Kampala, Uganda: Comboni Missionaries, 1999).
- Närman, A., 'Karamoja: Is Peace Possible?', *Review of African Political Economy*, 30 (2003), 129–133.
- Ocan, Charles, 'Pastoral Crisis and Social Change in Karamoja', in *Uganda: Studies in Living Conditions and Popular Movements and Constitutionalism*, ed. by Mahmood Mamdani and Joe Oloka-Onyango (Kampala, Uganda: JEP Books, 1994).
- Olowo Onyango, Eria, 'Pastoralists in Violent Defiance of the State. The Case of the Karimojong in Northeastern Uganda' (The University of Bergen, 2010).
- Ondoga, J., *Opportunities for Alternative Livelihoods in Karamoja* (European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010).
- Ospina, Sonia, 'Qualitative Research', *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications, 2004)
- Oxfam, *Karamoja Conflict Study: A Report* (Oxfam, 2000).
- , *Survival of the Fittest: Pastoralism and Climate Change in East Africa* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxfam, 2008).

- O'Connell Davidson, Julia, and Caitlin Farrow, *Child Migration and the Construction of Vulnerability* (Stockholm, Sweden: Save the Children Sweden, 2007).
- O'Keefe, Mark, 'Chronic Crises in the Arc of Insecurity: a Case Study of Karamoja', *Third World Quarterly*, 31 (2010), 1271–1295.
- Österle, Matthias, 'From Cattle to Goats: The Transformation of East Pokot Pastoralism in Kenya', *Nomadic Peoples*, 12 (2008), 81–91.
- Peristiany, J. G., 'The Age-Set System of the Pastoral Pokot. Mechanism, Function and Post-"Sapana" Ceremonies', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 21 (1951), 279–302.
- , 'The Age-Set System of the Pastoral Pokot. The "Sapana" Initiation Ceremony', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 21 (1951), 188–206.
- Powell, Joe, *Karamoja: A Literature Review* (London, United Kingdom: Saferworld, 2010).
- Prins, Herbert H. T., 'The Pastoral Road to Extinction: Competition Between Wildlife and Traditional Pastoralism in East Africa', *Environmental Conservation*, 19 (1992), 117–123.
- Quam, Michael D., 'Cattle Marketing and Pastoral Conservatism: Karamoja District, Uganda, 1948-1970', *African Studies Review*, 21 (1978), 49–71.
- Refstie, H., and C. Brun, 'Towards Transformative Participation: Collaborative Research with "Urban IDPs" in Uganda', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 25 (2011), 239–256.
- Russell, Shannon David, Martin Patrick Kabanda, and Ann Bett, *Uganda's Response to Street Children: Investigating the Validity and Impact of the Kamparingisa National Rehabilitation Centre (KNRC) in Working with*

- Street Children in Uganda* (Hadlow, Kent, United Kingdom: Oasis International, 2005).
- Saferworld, *Karamoja Conflict and Security Assessment* (London, United Kingdom: Saferworld, 2010).
- Samatar, Abdi Ismail, 'Social Classes and Economic Restructuring in Pastoral Africa: Somali Notes', *African Studies Review*, 35 (1992), 101–127.
- Sato, Shun, 'How the East African Pastoral Nomads, Especially the Rendille, Respond to the Encroaching Market Economy', *African Study Monographs*, 18 (1997), 121-135.
- Schensul, Jean J., Margaret D. LeCompte, Alfred G. Hess, Bonnie K. Nastasi, and Marlene J. Berg, *Using Ethnographic Data: Interventions, Public Programming and Public Policy* (London, United Kingdom: AltaMira Press, 1999).
- Shazali, Salah, 'Effecting Development: Reflections on the Transformation of Agro- Pastoral Production Systems in Eastern Sudan', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, 2000).
- Shenton, Andrew K., 'Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects', *Education for Information*, 22 (2004), 63–75.
- Sikana, Patrick M., and Carol K. Kerven, 'The Impact of Commercialisation on the Role of Labour in African Pastoral Societies' (London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute, 1991).
- Starr, Martha A., 'Risk, Environmental Variability and Drought-Induced Impoverishment: The Pastoral Economy of Central Niger', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 57 (1987), 29–50.

- Stefansky Huisman, Carrie, 'Once Patriarchs and Warriors: Masculinity and Modernity in Karamoja, Uganda', *Praxis: The Fletcher Journal of Human Security*, XXVI (2011), 60–80.
- Stites, Elizabeth, 'Papers on the Policy Discussion Regarding the Creation of a National Pastoralist Policy' (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2010).
- Stites, Elizabeth, and Darlington Akabwai, *Changing Roles, Shifting Risks: Livelihood Impacts of Disarmament in Karamoja, Uganda* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2009).
- , 'Life in Town: Migration from Rural Karamoja to Moroto and Mbale' (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2012).
- , "'We Are Now Reduced to Women": Impacts of Forced Disarmament in Karamoja, Uganda', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 24–43.
- Stites, Elizabeth, Darlington Akabwai, Dyan Mazurana, and Priscillar Ateyo, *Angering Akujũ: Survival and Suffering in Karamoja. A Report on Livelihoods and Human Security in the Karamoja Region of Uganda* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2007).
- Stites, Elizabeth, Lorin Fries, and Darlington Akabwai, *Foraging and Fighting: Community Perspectives on Natural Resources and Conflict in Southern Karamoja* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2010).
- Stites, Elizabeth, Dyan Mazurana, and Darlington Akabwai, *Out-migration, Return, and Resettlement in Karamoja, Uganda: The Case of Kobulin, Bokora County* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2007).

- Stites, Elizabeth, and Carrie Stefansky Huisman, *Adaptation and Resilience: Responses to Changing Dynamics in Northern Karamoja, Uganda* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University and Save the Children Uganda, 2010).
- Sundal, Mary B., 'Nowhere to Go: Karimojong Displacement and Forced Resettlement', *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2010), 72–86.
- Tache, Boku, 'Changing Patterns of Resource Control Among the Borana Pastoralists of Southern Ethiopia: A Lesson for Development Agencies', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, 2000).
- Tacoli, Cecilia, 'Changing Rural-Urban Interactions in Sub-Saharan Africa and Their Impact on Livelihoods: A Summary' (London, United Kingdom: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 2001).
- Tacoli, Cecilia, and Richard Mabala, *Exploring Mobility and Migration in the Context of Rural-Urban Linkages: Why Gender and Generation Matter* (London, United Kingdom: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)).
- Thorsen, Dorte, "If Only I Get Enough Money for a Bicycle!" A Study of Childhoods, Migration and Adolescent Aspirations Against a Backdrop of Exploitation and Trafficking in Burkina Faso' (Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, 2007).
- Tiffen, Mary, 'Transition in Sub-Saharan Africa: Agriculture, Urbanization and Income Growth', *World Development*, 31 (2003), 1343–1366.
- Tolera, Assefa, 'Problems of Sustainable Resource Use Among Pastoralist Societies: The Influence of State Intervention on the Pastoral Life of the Karrayyu', in *Pastoralists and Environment: Experiences from the Greater Horn of Africa*, ed. by Leif Manger and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (Addis

Ababa, Ethiopia: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, 2000).

Watson, Elizabeth E., 'A "hardening of Lines": Landscape, Religion and Identity in Northern Kenya', *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 4 (2010), 201–220.

Weatherby, John M., 'The Secret Spirit Cult of the Sor in Karamoja', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 58 (1988), 210–229.

Whitehead, Ann, Iman M. Hashim, and Vegard Iversen, 'Child Migration, Child Agency and Inter-generational Relations in Africa and South Asia' (Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, 2007).

Young, Lorraine, 'Journeys to the Street: The Complex Migration Geographies of Ugandan Street Children', *Geoforum*, 35 (2004), 471–488.

---, 'The "Place" of Street Children in Kampala, Uganda: Marginalisation, Resistance, and Acceptance in the Urban Environment', *Society and Space*, 21 (2003), 607–627.