

African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

International Research and Development Conference (IRDeC) Special Issue

Pages: 273- 291

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON WELFARE AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN MBALE DISTRICT, UGANDA

Wabomba Kadili

Department of Economics and Statistics, Kampala International university

kadili.wabomba@kiu.ac.ug

Abstract

In Bungokho Sub County, Mbale District, Eastern Uganda, the study examined the impact of socioeconomic and demographic factors on welfare among households. A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather data from a sample of 184 houses based on a descriptive study methodology. The household welfare was assessed and estimated using the Possession Score Index. Software from STATA and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences were used to process and analyze the data using regression, ANOVA, and frequency counts. The study's primary conclusions demonstrated a relationship between household employment, marital status, gender, and educational attainment and welfare in the Mbale district. The study also showed that households headed by women had lower welfare than households headed by men. The welfare of married household leaders was superior to other classifications. Household heads with ages under 35 and over 45 showed low welfare. The welfare of employed family heads, like civil servants, was superior to that of households headed by peasants and casual laborers. Compared to household heads with certificates and those without any formal education, those with higher education levels degrees and diplomas were found to have better welfare. At the 5% level, variables including gender and household occupation were statistically significant (sig. value < 0.05). The majority of other variables, including household size, age, marital status, and education level, were not statistically significant at the 5% level (sig. values > 0.05), making it difficult to identify the degree of household welfare in the mbale district. According to the study, policy solutions that would improve access to high-quality education, community development, affordable healthcare, regulatory reforms, and basic service accessibility would all contribute to the welfare of the Mbale District. This finding suggests that the Ugandan government has to improve and expedite rural area development, particularly in the district of Mbale's less developed parts. Better rural development would therefore draw more opportunities to expand rural economic activity and raise the standard of living in the community.

1.0 Introduction

Many people in today's world have strong beliefs regarding their relative incomes and growth. Welfare needs advocates have long emphasized how crucial it is to understand welfare in terms of society's

overall well-being. Since an equitable income distribution would help eliminate individual inequality within the setting, welfare maximization is thought to require it. When one household's well-being within a community improves without negatively affecting another household within the same community, welfare is maximized. The primary focus shifts to socioeconomic and demographic aspects related to welfare when the greatest benefit for the greatest number is achieved. Pareto, Vilfredo (1976).

Several administrations and educational institutions have consistently progressed in several areas related to welfare maximization. The Cardinal Economists hold that socioeconomic elements were viewed as a prerequisite for maximizing welfare, and their arguments were predicated on the idea that these characteristics would result in the production of household income and employment prospects. Additionally, the welfare function is said to consist of household items and utilities. (2015) Jeremy Bentham.

Within 30 years, Uganda's economy is expected to shift from being primarily peasant and low-income to a modern, wealthy, and competitive upper middle-income nation thanks to Uganda's Vision 2040, which offers development pathways and strategies to achieve this goal (NPA, 2019/2020). Uganda Vision 2040 expands on the advancements achieved in tackling the strategic Since Uganda's independence, a number of obstacles have impeded its socioeconomic growth, including a lack of industrialization, a weak private sector, underdeveloped human resources, inadequate infrastructure, a small market, ideological disorientation, underdeveloped services sector, underdeveloped agriculture, and weak democracy (MFPED, 2020).

The majority of socioeconomic, demographic, and overall economic wellbeing aspects in Uganda are conceptualized in Vision 2040. Poorer mental health and wellbeing are consistently predicted to be the result of the present welfare benefit reforms (UBOS, 2013/2015). A number of other mechanisms have been put forth to explain why welfare inequalities have increased, including declining incomes, rising food poverty, rising stigma, and declining housing security. These mechanisms emphasize how multiple, long-lasting effects are at work that leave a household scarred for years to come. The study backs the goal of providing all impoverished, vulnerable, and marginalized Ugandans with some kind of social protection. Welfare objectives are, however, hampered by fundamental issues including funding, upholding political commitments, sustainability, administrative capacity, focusing on the most disadvantaged, and a lack of qualified workers in vital social sectors like the environment, health, and education. Due to its small tax base and severe poverty, Uganda has very little fiscal resources available for distributing to the poor, despite the country's dire need for redistribution (Spicker, 1996).

It is obvious that a sizable amount of the money spent on social safety programs will require outside funding. as opposed to being paid for directly by the government or through self-funded insurance and pensions. Spending on "development" initiatives for welfare will always take precedence over social protection programs due to the intense competition for government funding. This is partially due to the widespread perception of social protection as "charity" or "welfare handouts" that waste limited public resources without producing any meaningful economic benefits (Bank, 2016). Because poverty in the district appears to be addressed at the national level rather than the subcounty or

household level, a study was conducted to determine the relationship between welfare and socioeconomic and demographic parameters among the households in Bungokho subcounty, Mbale District, Eastern Uganda.

2.0 Literature review

The study's primary foundation was the neoclassical Assets and Financial/Income Risk Theory, which Alfred Marshall created in 1890 and published as "Principle of Economics," widely regarded as the first and most important work of neoclassical economics. As a result, the theory clarifies how social participation and welfare status are related to asset scarcity. Households who possess sufficient assets tend to be less vulnerable to swings in income, which may indicate a low welfare status. Consequently, compared to other types of households, there is a higher chance of falling into poverty in terms of welfare due to shock and negative income multipliers. Sanchez and Davis, 2014). The study linked household possession assets and welfare using the theory as its base and income financial risks to determine the genuine wellbeing of the household welfare among household in Mbale district, Uganda.

Since the term "socio-economic characteristics" has a wide definition, it is only used to refer to a few variables in this study that are thought to have an impact on welfare. The first variable is income per capita, which is essentially the economic status of a region relative to its entire population over a specific time period. The additional value that every citizen contributes to the manufacturing process can also be expressed in terms of per capita income. A common metric for describing the degree of population welfare in a given location is per capita income. The ability of the community to meet requirements rises along with per capita income, which promotes greater prosperity of the community itself. This of course have an impact on reducing the level of poverty in an area (Wintara et al., 2021).

Additionally, the open unemployment rate is a socioeconomic statistic that is used to show how people are able to create income in order to meet their basic necessities. A high degree of budgeting will have an effect on raising economic inequality in a nation and reducing welfare. Saunders (2002) studied a sample of individuals who were both employed and jobless. The findings demonstrated that jobless people not only felt less financially secure, but also scored worse mentally on self-acceptance and surroundings.

The word "demography" is derived from the Greek and means "writing about people" (Julkhaidar et al., 2020). The International Union for Scientific Study claims that Population or Demography, according to IUSSP (1982), is the science of population, with a focus on population size, distribution, traits, and growth. The dependence ratio is the variable that is thought to represent the demographic traits. The dependence ratio is the ratio between the total population aged 0-14 years, and the population 65 years and beyond (both referred to as non-labor force) compared to the total population aged 15-64 years (labor force). Whether a nation is categorized as developed or developing, its economic state can be approximately depicted by using the dependency ratio as an indication. The percentage of reliance is a crucial demographic metric. The burden that must be placed on the productive population to support the lifestyles of the unproductive and unproductive population increases with the percentage of the dependency ratio.

In order to determine the welfare levels, Sender and Smith (1990) examined the relationship between class and gender in rural Tanzania. They did this by using a measure of wealth accumulation, namely the possession score. A basic indicator of poverty, the possession score is based on the material well-being of households and uses the possession of assets as a criterion. It emphasizes items that are thought to be essential to the wellbeing of the home, such as durable assets. Each asset is assigned a score in the index calculation process. The highest score allowed and the degree of deprivation attained to differentiate the impoverished from the non-poor. Their goal was to study the impoverished to identify the factors that separate the impoverished homes that provide wage labor for agriculture from the poor households that do not. The possession of a metal roof, non-mud walls, a watch, light, radio, bicycle, coat, sweater, two or more pairs of shoes, two or more mattresses, three or more beds, three or more chairs, four or more rooms, and four or more stools are among the 14 points that Sender and Smith (1990) adopted in order to distinguish between the impoverished and the rich households. A household was classified as poor if it received a score of 0–9 (inclusive), and non-poor if it had a score of 10 or higher. In the end, 85% of the households were impoverished. The possession score method has several advantages over other approaches, including low data requirements and high accuracy. Additionally, the questions used to calculate the possession score and their answers can frequently be verified visually.

3.0 Materials and methods

3.1 Study Design, setting, and Population

Because both quantitative and qualitative data were employed in the analysis, the study had a descriptive aspect. According to the researcher, the primary goal of the descriptive study was to explain the significant connections between socioeconomic and demographic characteristics and welfare. By analyzing a sample of the population, a quantitative survey approach was used to produce a numerical description of the trends, attitudes, and opinions of households in Bungokho Sub County. The sample size was determined using Yamane's (1967) simple instruction formula. families from five villages, which stand in for the five parishes that make up Bungokho Sub County in the Mbale District: Bubirabi, Bushikori, Bumageni, Khamoto, and Lwambogo. To represent the entire Subcounty of five parishes and 37 settlements, the researcher chose 203 homes.

3.2 Sample size and sampling procedure

The sample size was determined using Yamane's (1967) simple instruction formula. Given that there are 34,532 households in the Bungokho Subcounty overall (UBOS, 2020), with a 95% confidence level and a precision (e) of +7%, the following calculation can be used:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

$$n = \frac{34,532}{1 + 34,532(0.07)^2} = 203$$

The study employed stratified random sampling since households were located in different parishes, then purposive for people with adequate information for interviews

3.3 Variables measurement

Welfare was the outcome variable. Several assets were utilized in the study to gauge well-being in order to determine the degree of household welfare. A permanent home, a phone, a television, land, a bicycle, a car, a motorbike, or other vehicle, as well as financial assets like a bank account and a phone, basic healthcare, and education were among the assets taken into consideration.

3.4 Quality control, data collection procedures and tools

To assist with the data gathering process, seasoned RAs with at least a diploma in social, economic, and health sciences were hired. In addition to their proficiency in the local languages of Lugisu and Kiswahili, as well as English, RAs were chosen for the position based on their prior work with households and community-based research survey administration. They received orientation on the study protocol, which covered the goals and methods of the investigation. They received training on the tool/questionnaire, interview techniques, and ethical issues as well. In the rural areas of Bungokho subcounty, Mbale district, the questionnaire was translated into Lugisu and Kiswahili to improve the quality of data collection. Pretesting of the questionnaires allowed the RAs to become acquainted with the data collecting technology and made sure the respondents understood the questions. The researcher personally oversaw research assistants (RAs) during fieldwork to make sure they adhered to ethical guidelines and the study protocol when interviewing respondents.

The Cronbach reliability coefficient and Cronbach Alpha of at least 0.7, which indicate that a self-administered questionnaire is reasonably trustworthy and consistent, were used to build reliability instruments. Additionally, content validity was guaranteed in cases where the study's conceptual framework was followed by the questions or items (Amin, 2003). Using the principles of micro ethics, the researcher ensured justice by not causing any emotional, physical, or psychological harm to any households during the study, and above all, entire respect for the study participants, their voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality.

3.5 Data management and analysis plan

Surveys were gathered from the field. Data were cleaned by identifying and eliminating mistakes and inconsistencies, eliminating duplicates, and harmonizing the data. Data was analyzed mostly using statistical software like SPSS and STATA, and descriptive statistics were used. The data was categorized under the Univariate, Bivariate, and Binary Level Analysis categories. Furthermore, because the dependent variable has two categories, a binary logistic model was applied. Welfare status was categorized as rich or poor based on welfare status, which was a dependent variable. These two categories are mutually exclusive, as was discussed in the univariate analysis above. The Binary Logistic model assisted in linking the dependent variable to the explanatory variable, as shown in a conceptual framework. The researcher assumed a linear between the dependent (outcome) variable and the explanatory (predictor) variables. The model was illustrated as below;

$$\pi(x) = \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta_i x_i}}{1 + e^{\alpha + \beta_i x_i}}$$

Whereby; $\pi(x)$ = represented the probability of having poor welfare at a level of determinate (x)

x_i = represented the explanatory variables which are, age (x_1), gender (x_2), HH size (x_3), marital status (x_4), occupation (x_5), education level (x_6) and household status (x_7) that are associated to household welfare.

β_i = the coefficients associated with the explanatory variables to be estimated in the model.

ε_i = the error term associated with the model and α = the constant of the model

4.0 Results

4.1 Response Rate of the Households

The study considered a sample size of 203 households from the sample size determination in chapter three. Accordingly, 203 household questionnaires were distributed and the study findings were analyzed in subsequent table 1 below

Table 1: Showing Study Response Rate of households in Bungokho subcounty

Household Questionnaires	Number of Respondents
Household Questionnaires distributed out	203
Household Questionnaires retrieved	199
Household Questionnaires fully completed	184
Household Questionnaires with blank spaces	15
Household Questionnaires considered for analysis	184
Response rate (%)	90.6%

Source: primary data, 2022

According to the study's findings, 203 home questionnaires were sent out, and as Table 1 above shows, 199 of those surveys were collected from the field. Since only 15 home questionnaires had blank sections and 184 had complete responses, 184 household questionnaires were taken into consideration for analysis since they contained sufficient, accurately completed information from households. This suggested that the study had an excellent response rate. The study's 90.6% response rate aligns with Sekaran's (2003) assertion that a good survey response rate should be at least 50%.

4.2 Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

Demographic factors such as age, gender and structure of household leadership were mainly taken into account in the research. Four age groups were identified for households: 18–24, 25–34, 35–45, and 45 years and older. Gender in houses was divided into male and female households. The household leadership structure was divided into three categories: households headed by men and women,

households headed by women and men, and households headed by men alone. Table 2 below provided an example of this.

Table 2: showing the distribution of Demographic Factors among the households

Demographic factors	Frequencies	Percentages
Age of the household		
18-24	10	5.4
25-34	27	14.7
35-44	56	30.4
45 above	91	49.5
Total	184	100.0
Gender of the household		
Female	60	32.6
Male	124	67.4
Total	184	100.0
Household leadership structure		
Both male and female headed	110	59.8
Female headed only	52	28.3
Male headed only	22	12.0
Total	184	100.0

Primary data, 2022

The age distribution of homes showed that 91 (49.5%) of them included members who were older than 54. The availability of households that provided positive responses during the research data gathering process is what made this number high. Based on the data, 56 households (30.4%) belonged to the age group of 35 to 44 years, 27 houses (14.7%) to the age group of 25 to 34 years, and only 10 families (5.4%) to the age group of 18 to 24 years. Because of their attendance at school, a tiny fraction of households with adults between the ages of 18 and 24 were found to have done casual labor in towns. Middle-aged households, in general, gave accurate and trustworthy information on the demographic aspects influencing their welfare status. The study's findings regarding household gender showed that, with a larger number of 124 (67.4%), the bulk of the homes were male. This suggested that, of the 184 households sampled, only 60 (or 32.6%) had female respondents, indicating that male respondents bear greater obligations in many families. According to this survey, households in the Subcounty with male heads were more likely to face welfare issues.

Additionally, it was discovered through the structure of household leaderships that the Subcounty is dominated by both male and female families, with a larger average percentage of 110 (59.8%). This resulted from a low level of family strife and torture since everyone was listening to one another for the family's growth. There were 52 homes led by women (28.3%), and only 22 houses headed by men

(12.0%). The female headed families was a result of death of their husbands, marriage divorces and separation. This study therefore agrees that demographic factors are always vital in the maximization of household welfare in Bungokho Subcounty.

4.3 Socio-Economic determinants and welfare in Bungokho Sub County

Several social, economic, and demographic factors were identified in the study in accordance with the specific objective of the research, which is to determine the socio-economic and demographic determinants of welfare among households in Bungokho Sub County; however, the demographic factors were covered in tables 2. The study employed social and economic characteristics, such as the job status and source of income of the household, as well as the education level and marital status of the head of the home. Table 3 displays the findings as percentages and frequencies.

Table 3: Socio-Economic characteristics of household in Bungokho Sub County

Factor	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Marital status	Single/never married	3	1.6
	Married	116	63.0
	Widowed	32	17.4
	Divorced	15	8.2
	Separated	18	9.8
	Total	184	100.0
Education level of household head	No Education	10	5.4
	Certificate	61	33.2
	Diploma	66	35.9
	Degree	47	25.5
	Total	184	100.0
Occupation of the household head	Peasant farmer	106	57.6
	Civil servant	20	10.9
	Laborer/Casual	39	21.2
	Others	19	10.3
	Total	184	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2022

The socioeconomic features of Bungokho Sub County families are displayed in Table 3. According to the data, 116 (63% of the household heads in the sub county are married, and 32 (17.4%) are widowed. These figures indicate the marital status of the household heads. Just 3 respondents (1.6%), who were household heads, stated that they were single or had never been married, while 18 (9.8%) and 15 (8.2%) respondents said they were separated and divorced, respectively.

The results of the study show that the majority of household heads in the sub county—66, or 35.9%—completed their diploma level, followed by 61, or 33.2%. This suggests that the education level of the household head is a key social determinant in predicting household well-being. those who said they

had finished up to the certificate level. Furthermore, according to the study's findings, 25.5% of the 184 households that were sampled had completed their education up to the degree level. Even still, 10 respondents (5.4%) stated they had never attended school, even though the majority of household heads claimed to have at least attended.

In order to examine how the occupation of the head of the household affects the quantity of assets owned by the household, four categories peasant farmer, government servant, laborer/casual worker, and others were employed. The study's conclusions show that, in Bungokho Sub County, peasant farmers make up the majority of household heads with 106 (57.6%), followed by laborers or casual workers with 39 (21.2%). Merely 20 (10.9%) heads of households reported to be civil servants. The majority of these were primary school teachers and healthcare providers from the Sub County's health centers. Nineteen (10.3%) respondents said they belonged to others, mostly retired and jobless people. Since the majority of household heads are casual workers and peasant farmers, it follows that these households are likely to have fewer assets because casual work is low-paying and offers no job security, forcing people to live in deprivation. Peasant farming only provides food for daily consumption.

4.4 Distribution of other social Economic factors among households in Bungokho Sub County.

Several indicators were employed in the study to quantify well-being in order to determine the level of household wellbeing. Having a family, a place to live, access to clean water, a job, a basic level of health and education, and daily spending rate were all taken into account. As seen by table 4 that follows, the distribution of the components was expressed in frequencies and percentages.

Table 4: Distribution of Social-Economic factors

Indicator	Category	Frequency	Percentage
I own accommodation	Strongly Disagree	34	18.5
	Disagree	47	25.5
	Not sure	02	1.1
	Agree	51	27.7
	Strongly Agree	50	27.2
	Total		184
Household live in polygamous family	Strongly Disagree	39	21.2
	Disagree	30	16.3
	Not sure	1	0.5
	Agree	54	29.3
	Strongly Agree	60	32.6
	Total		184
Household live on substance farming only	Strongly Disagree	11	6.0
	Disagree	16	8.7

	Not sure	04	2.2
	Agree	30	16.3
	Strongly Agree	123	66.8
	Total	184	100.0
Household practice commercial farming	Strongly Disagree	118	64.1
	Disagree	34	18.5
	Not sure	03	1.6
	Agree	20	10.9
	Strongly Agree	09	4.9
	Total	184	100.0
There is clean water for household	Strongly Disagree	32	17.4
	Disagree	21	11.4
	Not sure	09	4.9
	Agree	73	39.7
	Strongly Agree	49	26.6
	Total	184	100.0
I can spend a minimum amount of UGX.3700 per day	Strongly Disagree	75	40.7
	Disagree	40	21.7
	Not sure	04	2.2
	Agree	38	20.6
	Strongly Agree	27	14.7
	Total	184	100.0
All people in my family are employed	Strongly Disagree	80	43.5
	Disagree	28	15.2
	Not sure	02	1.1
	Agree	50	27.2
	Strongly Agree	24	13.0
	Total	184	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2022

The data showed that 50 respondents, or roughly 27% of the households in Bungokho Sub County, confirmed that they are the owners of their accommodations. They went on to say that they had built the accommodations themselves. Of those surveyed, 25.5% disagreed that they are property owners. The lack of land and funds to construct any kind of shelter was the cause of this. For the same reasons lack of resources and land 18.5% of the households strongly opposed to own any kind of housing. Merely 1.1% did not know if they owned a home. These modest percentages suggest that the Sub County's population actually experiences low welfare and deprivation.

Additionally, the results showed that polygamous families had lower family incomes due to societal and religious constraints, which results in their poor financial welfare. With a greatest percentage of 66.8%, substance farming is the primary farming method used by households in Bungokho Subcounty. The majority of respondents firmly stated that they solely farmed for their own consumption and did not put anything on the market. The respondents went on to cite a lack of large enough acreage for commercial farming, a shortage of funding, and the need for enough food for large families. This indicated that just 4.9% of the households engaged in commercial farming, which was a strong agreement. Additionally, 16.3% of households in the data table indicated a moderate agreement percentage with substance farming. just 20 people or 10.9% agreed to engage in commercial farming. Approximately 4% of the households lacked knowledge about the farming practices used in the Subcounty. The researcher claims that extensive drug production in the Subcounty results in households having little social or financial income, which keeps them in low-welfare circumstances.

Additionally, when it came to clean water, 49 (26.6%) of the families strongly agreed that there is clean water in the Subcounty, trailing 73 (39.7%) of the houses who were in agreement. This was made possible by wise local leadership, which allowed certain homes to have piped national water connections while other households used boreholes. Even so, just 32 (17.4%) and 21 (11.4%) of the respondents strongly only 09 people (4.9%) were unsure whether clean water existed in the Subcounty; the remaining people disagreed and disagreed, respectively.

This resulted in the observation that the majority of Bungokho residents are unable to spend at least 3,700 Uganda shillings a day, indicating the low standard of living among households. Families contended that while some members of their family are civil servants for the local government, others are employed by private companies. It follows that in order to improve the socioeconomic welfare of the Sub County, the government must implement new policies and procedures that encourage modernized farming, provide clean water, and create more jobs.

4.5 Relationship between the Socio-Economic, Demographic factors and welfare in Bungokho Sub County- Mbale District

Table 5: ANOVA table showing the relationship between the Socio-economic, Demographic factors and Welfare level among households in Bungokho Sub county- Mbale District.

Socio-Economic and Demographic factor	Category	welfare status	
		Poor	Rich
Age of household head	18-24	100	0
	25-34	77.78	22.22
	35-44	75.0	25.0
	45 above	86.81	13.19
F- value =1.99, P- value = 0.1164, R. sq. = 0.0322 and df = 3			
Gender of household head	Male	76.52	23.48
	Female	98.08	1.92
F-value = 12.78, P-value = 0.0004, R. sq. = 0.0656 and df = 1			

Marital status of household head	Single/never married	100.0	0.0
	Married	76.72	23.28
	Widowed	93.75	6.25
	Divorced	86.67	13.33
	Separated	94.44	5.56
F-value = 2.07, P-value = 0.0872, R. sq. = 0.0441 and df = 4			
Education of household head	No Education	100.00	0.00
	Certificate	91.80	8.20
	Diploma	86.36	13.64
	University	61.70	38.30
F-value = 7.58, P-value = 0.0001, R. sq. = 0.1122, df = 3			
Occupation of household head	Peasant farmer	90.57	9.43
	Civil servant	10.00	90.00
	Laborer/casual	97.44	2.56
	Others	84.21	15.79
F-value = 50.47, P-value = 0.000, R. sq. = 0.4569 and df = 3			

Source: Primary data, 2022

According to the analysis, no family head in the 18-to-24-year age range was determined to be wealthy in terms of welfare, since the table showed that all household heads in that age range were 100% impoverished. This is because the majority of them were unemployed and did not amass any assets. Of the household heads in the 25–34 age range, 22.22% were well off, while 77.78% had poor welfare. Additionally, it was noted that only 25% of heads between the ages of 35 and 44 are well-off, while 75% of them are impoverished. Among those 45 years of age and over, 13.19% were wealthy and 86.81% had poor welfare. Poor welfare has been shown to be particularly prevalent in Bungokho Sub County, especially among household heads under 35 and over 45. This is explained by the fact that the household has not accrued money if the head is under 35 years old, and that productivity decreases if the head is above 45. Furthermore, the fact that the P-value (0.1164) is higher than the significance level of 0.05 and the F-value (small) of 1.99 suggests that there is no meaningful relationship between welfare and the age of the household head.

The age of the household head explains 3.22% of the household, according to the R-squared value of 0.0322. With respect to the head of the household's gender and welfare status, the results showed that 23.48% of households headed by men had rich welfare, while 76.52% of households headed by men had low welfare. However, only 1.92% of the homes headed by women were determined to have wealthy welfare, while the majority of these households (98.08%) had poor welfare. Even though it only accounts for 6.56% of the household's welfare status, the F-value of 12.78 and P-value of 0.0004 less than 0.05 showed a statistically significant link between the gender of the HH head and welfare.

The welfare condition of a home was also significantly influenced by the marital status of its members, and the analysis showed that the heads of single-or never-married, split, and widowed households had welfare rates higher than 93.5%, indicating inadequate welfare. With 76.72% of their households being

impoverished, married heads had the lowest percentage, followed by divorced heads. Compared to other categories where households are headed by a single person, married heads have a higher share of well-off households due to the large labor force of the mother, father, and children. Additionally, it was shown that there was no significant correlation between household welfare and marital status because the P-value (0.0872) is greater than 0.05 and the F-value (2.07) is tiny. Marital status appears to account for 4.41% of household welfare, according to the R-squared estimate.

It was shown that there was a statistically significant correlation between the welfare level and the education level of the household head from a relatively little P-value of $0.0001 < 0.05$ and a somewhat large F-value of 7.58. Additionally, it was shown that welfare levels decrease as education levels rise, with household heads with post-secondary or university degrees having a higher percentage of welfare families than the other groups. The wellbeing of those who never went to school was found to be at 100%; therefore, in Bungokho Sub County, education has a big impact on welfare.

The study's conclusions, when considering the household head's occupation, showed that there is a statistically significant association between the head of the household and the state of welfare in the home. A very large F-value of 50.47 and a very modest P-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ level of significance were used to observe this. Consequently, the R. Squared (0.4569) suggests that the HH head's occupation can account for up to 45.69% of the household welfare level. Based on the study conducted, it was shown that the majority of laborers and casual workers (97.44%) had poor welfare, followed by 90.57% of peasant farmers, 84.21% of those who belonged to others, and 10% of civil servants. This suggested that the degree of well-being in the home is highly influenced by the HH head's occupation.

4.6 Socio-Economic and Demographic Determinants of welfare in Bungokho Sub County

A binary logistic regression analysis was run on the socio-economic and demographic characteristic of households identified in the conceptual framework.

Table 6: A Binary Logistic Regression on the Socio-Economic and Demographic Determinants of Welfare in Bungokho Sub County- Mbale District

Variable	Category	Coefficient (β)	Odds ratio	Sig. value	Chi square value
Age	18-24*				7.478
	25-34	19.950	4.6168	.999	
	35-44	20.104	5.3858	.999	
	45 above	19.318	2.4548	.999	
Gender	Male*				16.248
	Female	-2.751	.064	.008	
Household size		-.157	.855	.054	4.046
Marital status of household head	Single/never married*				
	Married	20.010	4.9018	.999	
	Widowed	18.495	1.0778	.999	

	Divorced	19.331	2.4858	.999	9.682
	Separated	18.370	9.5037	.999	
Education level of household head	No Education*				20.303
	Certificate	18.787	1.4428	.999	
	Diploma	19.357	2.5518	.999	
	Degree	20.726	1.0039	.999	
Occupation of household head	Peasant farmer*				64.908
	Civil servant	4.459	86.400	.000	
	Laborer/casual	-1.376	.253	.197	
	Others	.588	1.800	.409	
* shows the reference variable and Rich is the baseline variable or comparison group					

Source: Primary data, 2022

The study's findings showed that all age groups were statistically not significant (sig. values >0.05); however, the odds ratio showed that the likelihood of a household in the 25–34 age range being wealthy in terms of welfare is 4.6168 times higher than that of households in other age groups. Compared to other age groups, the chances of an HH head between the ages of 35 and 44 being wealthy are 5.3858 times higher. This is because people in this age range are often industrious and have an easy time building up wealth and assets. HH heads who are 45 years of age or older have the lowest chances of becoming well-off with 2.4548 times higher than in other age brackets. This result is consistent with expectations since middle-aged individuals (35 to 50 years old) have high productivity and are generally well-off due to having accumulated assets and other types of wealth. Young and elderly persons are typically predicted to be lower on welfare than middle-aged individuals. Given how little the chi-square test result is, it appears that our ability to estimate the welfare status of the household has not enhanced when the age of the HH head is included in the model. The results also corroborate those of Ahmed's (2004) study on the sociodemographic factors influencing rural welfare in Bangladesh, which showed that low welfare was common among adolescents and adults of 45 years above in Bangladesh.

Since the sig. value was less than 0.05, it was determined that the gender of the head of the family had a negative relationship with household welfare ($\beta = -2.751$), which was statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. However, compared to the male counterfeits, the female headed households had a lower chances ratio (0.064) of having good welfare, suggesting that the welfare of the female headed households is likely to be lower. Furthermore, the inclusion of the gender variable in the model improved our capacity to forecast the welfare status of the family, as indicated by the chi-square value (16.248), which is comparatively high. This is connected to Ahmed's (2004) research on the sociodemographic correlates of welfare in Bangladesh, which showed that although there was a significant association between sex and welfare, women were poorer than men.

The study's results indicate that there is a negative correlation between household size and welfare ($\beta = -0.157$). However, at the 5% significance level (sig. value > 0.05), household size was not found to be statistically significant. This suggested that the likelihood of a household in Bungokho Sub County

achieving wellbeing decreases by 0.157 (15.7%) for every unit increase in household size. The probability that a household will be wealthy based on its size is indicated by the odds ratio of 0.855.

All of the household head's marital statuses were determined to be non-significant at the 5% level of significance based on higher significance values greater than 0.05. The odds ratio revealed further findings: married household heads are 4.9018 times more likely to be wealthy than other groups, and divorced household heads are 2.4858 times more likely to be wealthy than other marital status groups. It was shown that the heads of households who were bereaved or separated had the lowest chances of being wealthy. This suggested that among the bereaved and separated divorced heads, inadequate welfare is common. This was also the conclusion of Ahmed's (2004) study on the sociodemographic determinants of rural welfare in Bangladesh, which showed that unmarried women in Bangladesh who were either divorced or widowed were often poor welfare recipients. The chi-square value of 9.682, however, indicated that the model's capacity to forecast the welfare status of households in Bungokho Sub County is not improved by including marital status.

According to the study, education level also affects HH Welfare status, but the relationship is not statistically significant (sig. values > 0.05). Those with post-secondary/university education have a higher chance of being well-off than any other education group, with a likelihood of 1.0039 times that of diploma holders with certificates had the least odd (1.4428 times), and the likelihood was 2.551E8 times higher. This implied that as the amount of education of the head of the home increases, so does the poverty level. The chi-square value of 20.303 indicates that our ability to forecast the welfare status of households in the Sub County is comparatively increased when the head's education level is included in the model. The results of Eunice (2011), who examined the factors influencing wellbeing in Uganda, corroborate this conclusion. She found that heads of households with higher education levels are more likely to have better welfare because they can obtain employment that pays a respectable wage. Household heads who work as public servants are statistically significant at 5% (sig. value < 0.05) and are 86.4 times more likely to be well-off than heads of other households, according to the analysis of the head of the household's occupation and welfare status. While individuals in other categories are 1.8 times more likely to be wealthy in terms of welfare, laborers and casual workers, who were not significant (sig. value > 0.05), are 0.253 times more likely to have good welfare than other groups. A comparatively large chi-square value of 64.908 also showed that including the household head's occupation as a variable in the model improves our capacity to forecast the welfare status of the household.

5.0 Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate the demographic and socioeconomic factors that influence welfare in Bungokho Sub County. The study was primary and employed a descriptive research approach, utilizing both quantitative information household size and qualitative information gender and educational attainment. A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather the data, and a convenience non-probability sampling strategy was used. Regression analyses, frequency counts, percentages, and ANOVA tables were used to display the study's analysis results.

The results of the study's research showed that the welfare status of a household is statistically significantly influenced by the gender, occupation, and educational attainment of the household head. in Bungokho Sub County. At the 0.05 level of significance, the household head's age, marital status, and size did not, however, indicate any statistical relevance. Additionally, it was discovered that poor welfare predominates in households headed by people between the ages of 18 and 35 and 45 and older, with over 75% of those under 35 and nearly 86.81% of those over 45 having bad welfare. According to the gender of the household head, 98.02% of families headed by women and 76.52% of households headed by men are impoverished. Regarding marital status and welfare, it was discovered that 94.44% of separated people and 100% of single or never married people were determined to be poor, respectively. 93.75% of widowed people, 86.67% of divorced people, and 76.72% of married people are impoverished.

The study also discovered that the welfare status in Bungokho Sub County rises with the educational attainment of the household head. According to the analysis, people who never attended school were 100% impoverished, while those who completed their tertiary or university education had good welfare. Based on the HH head's occupation, it was discovered that 97.44% of laborers and casual workers, 90.57% of peasant farmers, 84.21% of those who belonged to others, and just 10% of civil servants were impoverished.

Although the age group of the household head was not shown to be important, it was shown that a higher percentage of household heads under 35 and over 45 were more likely to be poor welfare recipients. This is particularly true because, in contrast to young people who are just starting out, who struggle with accumulated rent, and elderly people who are less productive, household heads who are over 40 tend to become wealthier. The results of Rodriguez (2002) and Gang et al. (2004), who claimed that welfare is relatively high during childhood, rises during middle life, and then falls again during old age, are consistent with this conclusion. A study by also provides evidence for it. Willets (2007) on why wealth increases with age and poverty increases with age in the United States, despite the fact that the study found a substantial correlation between age and wealth.

The survey also showed that households headed by women had lower incomes than households headed by men. In this situation, cultural biases in favor of men often result in women being marginalized, disadvantaged, exploited, and persecuted. Most importantly, a few of these backwards traditions have completely or severely hampered their initiative and productivity, which has limited their opportunities to improve their standard of living. Married household heads were shown to have better welfare than heads of other types. This is explained by the fact that if both spouses work and pool their income to invest in different projects, they will build up capital and eventually be able to purchase the assets they want, making them wealthier than singles, widowed, divorced, and separated people who will find it difficult to obtain the resources necessary to purchase assets on their own.

The results also showed that the household head's education level had a significant role in determining the welfare of the household, with household heads who stopped their schooling at the tertiary/university level being better off than those who never attended school. Elevated degrees of

Higher levels of welfare are closely linked to education for both men and women (Grootaert, 1994). *Ceteris paribus*, he contended, a more educated farmer might not have a greater marginal production of labor, but he might gain from his knowledge by acquiring resources that he can utilize to his advantage alone. The report also notes that while education has a very little effect on household welfare in rural areas, it has a significant impact in metropolitan areas. The occupation of the head of the home was shown to have a substantial impact on the welfare of the household; families headed by civil servants had a higher welfare rating than households headed by peasant farmers and laborers.

5.1 Strengths and limitations

As far as I am aware, this is among the few research that have looked at the socioeconomic and demographic aspects of welfare in Bungokho, a rural Sub County in Mbale District, so far. The dearth of research studies in the same field of study restricted access to data and information on the welfare-related socioeconomic and demographic parameters. Additionally, the sample size was insufficient since the 184 homes that were chosen for the sample were insufficient to reflect all of the households in the Bungokho Sub County.

5.3 Conclusions

The following conclusions about the hypotheses were reached based on the study's findings. The welfare level of households in Bungokho does not significantly correlate with the age of the household head, as indicated by a tiny F-value of 1.99 and a sig. value of $0.1164 > 0.05$. Female-headed households tend to be poorer than male-headed households. This was demonstrated by the fact that there are comparatively poorer female-headed households roughly 98.08% than male-headed households 76.52%. The head of the home's level of education is positively connected with the welfare status of the household. A rather high F-value (7.58) and a tiny p-value of $0.0001 < 0.05$ were used to identify this. The head of the household's occupation has a big impact on the welfare levels in the household. A significantly lower p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ and a significantly larger F-value of 50.47 were indicative of this. There is no statistically significant correlation between a household's welfare status and marital status. A very low F-value of 2.07 and a high P-value of $0.0872 > 0.05$ were used to observe this. Based on these considerations, the research suggests that the household welfare level in Bungokho Sub County is significantly correlated with the gender of the Household Head, the education level of the household head, and the occupation of the household head.

5.4 Recommendations

Instruction and Practice. Expand the availability of high-quality training and education opportunities, especially for disadvantaged populations. Investing in education gives households the information and skills they need to find better jobs and end the cycle of welfare and poverty.

Development of the Community. Encourage community involvement and self-determination by lending assistance to grassroots groups and projects. Encourage social support systems, community togetherness, and teamwork to solve local problems and enhance wellbeing as a whole.

changes to policies. Encourage the revision of laws to advance social equality, lessen income inequality, and safeguard the rights of disadvantaged groups. This could include laws pertaining to taxes, social protection, labor rights, and the minimum wage.

Access to basic services. Ensure access to clean water, sanitation facilities, electricity and other basic services. These services are essential for improving living conditions and overall well-being

References

Agenor, C. Jesko, S. Hentschel, and Quentin T. (2002). welfare Measurement and Analysis. *Core Techniques and Cross-Cutting Issues*, Vol.1

Ali, S. and Tahir, S. (1999), “Dynamics of Growth, Poverty and Inequality in Pakistan,”
The Pakistan Development Review, Vol. 38 (1), 837-857

Cantillan N, (2004). The socio-demographic, correlates of rural poverty in Bangladesh.
e- Journal of sociology, Volume .1. No.2

Carlo R, Alan D, Helen G, Dave H, Lisa J and Afroditi K, (2007). Education and welfare. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*. York YO30 6WP. Website: www.jrf.org.uk.

David, T. and Sanchez G. 2014. Equity and Vulnerability: Uganda National Situation Analysis For Women, Children and Adolescents.

<https://www.local2030.org/library/234/ICLEI-SDGs-Briefing-Sheets-04-The-importance-of-all-Sustainable-Development-Goals-SDGs-for-cities-and-communities.pdf>

Imran. S, Shahnawaz. M and Aboul, H. (2009). The Impact of Socioeconomic and Demographic Variables on Poverty: A Village Study. *The Lahore Journal of Economics*: pp. 39-6

Kathleen B, Luc C, Andrew D, and Isis G, (2016). Poverty in a rising Africa. *International Bank For Reconstruction and Development /the World Bank*, doi: 10.1596/978-1-4648-0723-7

LDLG 5yr. DP II, (2015). Mbale District Local Government first five-year development plan II Financial year (2015/16-2019/20). Website: www.npa.ug. acc. on 5/feb/2018

Lutter E and Knight M, (2009). Conceptualizations of Poverty. *Danish Institute for International Studies* ISBN 978-87-7605-369-7. Website: www.diis.dk.

Mbale District Local Government Report, (2010). Sub county Development Programme, Vol. I

Mark, S. (2011). A Simple Poverty Scorecard for Uganda. *Microfinance Risk Management*

Mckay, L. Usman, A. Gafar, T. (2009). Determinants of Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, Ethiopia, Vol. 3 (2), (Pp. 162-177)

MFPEd. 2020. Uganda’s Economic Performance since 1986, when the NRM Government Came to power’, (12th May 2020).

- Philip D and Miguel S, (2014). A review of the economic theories of poverty. *National institute of economic and social research*, Discussion Paper No. 435
- Prennushi, G.2008 Macroeconomic Crises and Poverty: Transmission Mechanisms and Policy Responses” World Bank Working Paper
- Schultz. T, (1981). Theories of welfare and Anti-Poverty Programs in Community Development. *Rural Poverty Research Center*, RPRC Working Paper No. 06-05
- Sen, A. (2003). Effective poverty eradication in Mbale-Uganda, Gabazira’s blog
- Spicker, C. (1996). Determinants of Poverty in Cote d’Ivoire in the 1980’s. *Journal of African Economies*, Vol.6 No.2 (PP.169-196).
- UBOS.2013/2015.Plan for Modernization of Agriculture in Uganda; Vision and Strategic Purpose, Kampala, (August 2015).
- UNDP, (2016). Uganda Poverty Status Report. *Economic development policy and research department*- website: www.undp.ug.org. Acc. on 31/march/-18
- Waite, G. 1995. Institutional; Development and Poverty Reduction”, Policy Series 2, Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich.
- Westover. S, (2008). Theories of Poverty/the Poverty of Theory, *BYU L. Rev.* 381
http://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/faculty_scholarship/370
accessed on 28/April/2018
- World Bank, 2016. “Uganda growing out of Poverty”. A World Bank Country Study, Washington D.C
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, an introductory analysis* (2nd Ed.) New York: Harper and Row