

JYX



JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Ahimbisibwe, Karembe F.

Title: Exploring Obutyamye as Material Citizenship in Busoga Subregion, Uganda

Year: 2022

Version: Published version

Copyright: © Authors, 2022

Rights: CC BY-NC 4.0

Rights url: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Please cite the original version:

Ahimbisibwe, K. F. (2022). Exploring Obutyamye as Material Citizenship in Busoga Subregion, Uganda. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 31(4), 329-349.

<https://doi.org/10.53228/njas.v31i4.962>

Exploring *Obutyamye* as Material Citizenship in Busoga Subregion, Uganda

Karemba F. Ahimbisibwe

Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Finland


hkaremba@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores how being a citizen is inexorably bound up with the resources individuals own and deploy to support livelihoods in the rural locations of postcolonial states. Drawing on the works of Kabeer (2006) and Baglioni (2016), the article zooms in on how citizenship is manifestly and inescapably material in the Busoga subregion of eastern Uganda. Data for the article were collected using qualitative methods among beneficiaries of antipoverty programmes implemented by Action for Development (ACFODE), a national non-governmental organization (NGO). Findings show that, locally, citizenship is understood as *obutyamye*, connoting an (un)equal experience of being *in, for* and *with* the community based on what one owns. ACFODE interventions that resonate with and address the material needs of the community have crucial implications for the localised practice of citizenship. What *obutyamye* portends for community belonging is discussed with a focus on how NGO antipoverty initiatives both challenge and reproduce local power asymmetries related to gender and resource ownership. In conclusion, the article highlights the crucial role NGOs' antipoverty efforts play in strengthening people's material well-being and, potentially, their citizenship status and agency at the small scale.

Keywords: Material citizenship, antipoverty, NGO, *obutyamye*, Busoga, Uganda

DOI: 10.53228/njas.v31i4.962



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

About the author

Karembe F. Ahimbisibwe is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Development Studies in the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy at the University of Jyväskylä (Finland). He is an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Adult and Community Education at Makerere University (Uganda). His research interests include citizenship, civil society and livelihoods, participatory learning and development, and political economy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Academy of Finland for funding under the project “Growth into citizenship in civil society encounters” (decisions numbers 265812 and 285815) for enabling the fieldwork, and ACFODE for allowing our entry into the communities, and members of Isegero, Bubago and Bulongo villages who participated in this study.

Introduction

Universalist notions of citizenship as equal status enjoyed by members of a nation-state have been challenged by emergent debates that emphasize the plurality of contexts in which citizenship occurs. This article provides an empirical examination of the notion of material citizenship in agrarian locations of East Africa. Scholarship on material citizenship has recently gained attention in sociology (Baglioni 2016; Lee and Bartlett 2021), studies of autochthony (Geschiere 2009; Lund 2011), and in gender and development studies (Kabeer 2006; Lister 1997). Whilst these studies draw from a wide range of contexts and theoretical approaches and are, therefore, inconclusive and contestable, they generally suggest that a strong link exists between citizenship and different kinds of resources, assets, possessions, and relations. For example, property such as land (Geschiere 2009; Lund 2011), objects like paperwork and documents (Carswell and De Neve 2020), and socioeconomic and cultural capital (Baglioni 2016) have been identified as central in the everyday exercise and actualization of citizenship.

Similarly, several scholars have defined and described citizenship to illuminate the idea that a tight connection exists between “what we have and who we are” (Lund 2011, 71). Bryan Turner (1993), for instance, argues that the notion of citizenship encompasses a set of practices, which define a person as a member of society and, as a result, determine which resources such persons and social groups receive. More emphasis on the material nature of citizenship has been made by scholars suggesting that “it is difficult to exercise political and civil rights to the full, if hungry or homeless” (Lister 2008, 13), “since seeking redress for the violation of even the most basic of civil rights entails unaffordable costs” (Kabeer 2006, 98).

These viewpoints are particularly relevant in development studies where the conceptualization of citizenship is increasingly

broadened to incorporate “a form of personhood that links rights to agency” (Mukhopadhyay 2015, 613) of citizens to shape their destiny and respond to prevailing challenges (African Union Commission [AUC] 2015). Moreover, when studying citizenship in the context of developing countries, one is confronted with tales of how multiple dimensions of poverty and marginalization consign billions of people to a life of indignity (United Nations [UN] 2015; Harrison 2010), constraining their abilities to engage as citizens (Pettit 2016). Studies of gender in East Africa have, for example, noted that access to and control over resources, especially land, is at the heart of the unequal power distribution and citizenship experiences between and among men and women (Obika 2022; Bird and Espey 2010; Nyakato, Rwabukwali, and Cools 2020). In addition, a common saying in Uganda, *omwavu tasinga musango* (a poor person cannot win a [court] case) (Mbazira 2018; World Voices Uganda 2020), entrenches a popular perception that only the rich can get justice because they possess both the money to bribe and power to influence courts of law or any other place of arbitration.

That said, there are emerging empirical and longitudinal studies that seem to disagree with the narrative of the perpetual stagnation and inertia of agrarian economies, material life, and productivity in rural Africa. These studies claim that local people’s livelihoods and wellbeing are experiencing changes and transformation as a result of incremental learning, local organization, increased productivity, and asset accumulation (for details see Brockington and Noe 2021; Holma and Kontinen 2020c). At the heart of these modest changes are lived experiences of grassroots organization and mobilization around commonly felt problems and needs. Village-based groups, local churches, women’s associations, and ethnic groups have been identified as playing crucial roles in this largely state-absent rural modification and reconfiguration (Jones 2009). Moreover, informal spaces, par-

ticularly village-based self-help groups, have recently gained traction as conduits for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to implement antipoverty interventions (Mercer 2002; Banks, Hulme, and Edwards 2015). According to Banks, Hulme, and Edwards (2015, 713), going through “a less formalized grassroots-driven process of ‘associationalization’” is one of the various strategies adopted by NGOs in restrictive contexts to position themselves as partners – and not adversaries – of the state in development.

While much of the classic West-centric debate on citizenship has focused on conceptualizations of citizenship as equal membership and belonging to a nation state (eg., Kartal 2002; Ron 2014), in this article, I draw, instead, from scholarship that stresses a broadened understanding of citizenship as taking place in “heterogeneous sites and settings” (Clarke et al. 2014, 133) within and beyond the state as a legal and political entity. Accordingly, these studies suggest that citizenship can be perceived as a multi-layered (Yuval-Davis 1999), localized (Holma and Kontinen 2020b), flexible (Frey 2003) and gendered (Mukhopadhyay 2015) experience underpinned by a variety of meanings and interpretations. Based on these conceptualisations, the article adopts the notion of material citizenship to conceptualise the kinds of citizenship experiences described by community members partaking in an NGO’s antipoverty interventions in rural Uganda. The notion of material citizenship is used in this article to refer to the idea that people’s everyday experiences of being a citizen are anchored and expressed in their capacities to own, expand, utilize, and draw on diverse resources to improve personal wellbeing and fulfil the obligations and responsibilities that define a citizen in a locale. The concept of resources is used broadly to encompass all things, including material assets and property, relations, and the knowledge and skills around, with, and through which rural people strengthen their capabilities to meet their livelihood needs and express themselves

as citizens at the local level.

The relevance of the notion of material citizenship became apparent in a study of localized citizenship in Namutumba District in the Busoga subregion of eastern Uganda. In this particular location, participants seemed to value, and enthusiastically talked about, the modest material changes experienced in their lives resulting from the livelihood training in improved farming and food security offered by Action for Development (ACFODE), a national non-governmental organization (NGO). As I explain later, participants’ viewpoints emphasised how partaking in recent livelihood trainings conducted in the community by ACFODE broadly strengthened their diverse capacities to meet material needs and perform different roles expected of them as citizens at the level. On the basis of conversations with the participants, observations of everyday life and reflections on the notion of multiple conceptualizations of citizenship, it became apparent that the kinds of reported change in material conditions at the local level needed empirical exploration.

This article makes two contributions to contemporary debates in the field of citizenship and development studies. First, it introduces the notion of *obutyamyé* to illustrate an inherently material view of citizenship in the Busoga subregion of Uganda. Second, it shows that by strengthening the material wellbeing of participants, NGO antipoverty interventions contribute to the local perception and practice of citizenship, to which (in)equality is central. As I will show, *obutyamyé* relates to a sense of being rooted in the community by way of resource ownership, which leads some community members to share a sense of equal belonging and identity. Yet, because resources within the community are not evenly possessed, *obutyamyé* can also refer to the inequality of the community’s poorest members, particularly women and men without property. By conceptualising material citizenship in this way, this article, then, argues that the notion of citizenship as *obutyamyé* is inherently em-

bedded with inequalities along lines of gender and resource ownership. To explore these issues, I investigate the role played by diverse (material) resources in local understanding of citizenship and how ACFODE's antipoverty interventions impact on the understanding and practice of everyday experience of citizenship in Busoga subregion, Uganda.

The next section develops a theoretical conceptualization of material citizenship, which is followed by an introduction of the research context, highlighting the state of citizenship in Uganda and the Busoga subregion, and the research methods used. The article then presents research findings which show that resources are central in the understanding and practice of citizenship and the ways in which ACFODE interventions reinforce and challenge this understanding. This is followed by a discussion on the implications of material resources for local understanding and practice of citizenship. The article concludes with a suggestion for reconsideration of the role of the state in addressing systemic inequalities that constrain citizenship and are beyond the limited capacity of NGOs.

Towards a conceptualization of material citizenship in a post-colony

In this section I develop my approach to material citizenship by drawing on the work of two scholars: Kabeer's (2006) analysis of citizenship as embedded in material relations in postcolonial societies, and Baglioni's (2016) sociological analysis of material citizenship in the European context. I then use these ideas to reflect on the ability of NGOs' antipoverty initiatives both to strengthen and challenge prevailing citizenship practices in an agrarian setting.

Kabeer (2006) draws extensively on the evolution of Western liberal citizenship to illustrate how material resources have always been at the centre of exclusion in the theory and practice of citizenship. From the ancient

city-state of Athens where the concept of citizenship first emerged, it implied "a highly bounded community" in which "only those men with the material means, personal breeding and leisure to perform their civic duties counted as citizens" (Kabeer 2006, 91–92). This understanding endured through changing cultural and historical eras as women, slaves, serfs, and other low-caste human beings were not treated as citizens on the basis of their relations with property. Kabeer further argues that a catalogue of episodic reforms and revolutions progressively challenged this exclusivist conception of citizenship around the world. In particular, the Enlightenment era, the Industrial and French Revolutions, colonialism, (neoliberal) capitalism, and constitutional democracy led to the universalization of different levels of rights for citizens across the globe. In Europe, for example, the universalist conception of liberal citizenship emerged, as Kabeer writes:

(...) in the context of a series of major material and ideological upheavals (...) the decline of feudal property relations, the rise of capitalist markets and the modern state, the growing individuation of ideas of personhood, the real and ideological separation of the different spheres of society, encapsulated in the separation of the 'public' sphere of market, state and civil society and the 'private' sphere of family, kinship and community. (Kabeer 2006, 96)

She further argues that this citizenship model of "an individual as citizen, a sovereign human being, equal to all others, subject only to the laws of the land and the forces of the marketplace" (2006, 95) was transferred and bequeathed to post-colonial states without the corresponding socio-cultural systems and statecraft to enforce it. Moreover, the post-colonies were under traditional precapitalist systems where "claims to resources were generally grounded in variations of the 'moral

economy” (2006, 97). In Uganda, like most sub-Saharan Africa countries, the ‘moral economy’ was characterized by hierarchical socio-political relations (Babikwa 2004), although the communal way of life encapsulated in “the extended notion of family gave a wide range of kinfolk, neighbours and villagers, some degree of economic responsibility for each other” (Kabeer 2006, 95). The result of this transfer was “a fragmented notion of citizenship that reproduced, rather than disrupt, the socially ascribed statuses of kinship, religion, ethnicity, race, caste and gender” (2006, 97).

Baglioni’s (2016, 72) material approach to citizenship is shaped by a European liberal individualist context. His approach aims “to show what someone can do starting from his/her own resources (the capitals) and from those provided by national and local institutions (the rights)”. Using a sociological lens, Baglioni argues that a conceptualization of citizenship as juridical status in a society that is increasingly tilting towards government cuts and the shrinkage of welfare states is inadequate. To this end, he suggests a material approach to analyse how, in the era of a “spread of precariousness” (2016, 70), people use state-granted status and rights together with personal capabilities to live meaningfully and practically in society. Baglioni defines material citizenship as the “individual capability of a citizen or a group of people who share the same social condition to put into practice citizenship status in the areas of property, work, health and education, consumption and information” (2016, 71).

Central to Baglioni’s material approach to citizenship is the notion of capitals, which he describes as “socially enabling resources that help to define persons, allowing them to determine kinds of action, of reflection or of status, to a degree that varies according to what is available to the individual” (2016, 76).

Drawing on Bourdieu (1986), he categorizes capitals into four types. *Economic* capital is based on personal ownership of economic resources that are easily translated into monetary terms. *Cultural* capital embodies the cognitive resources that qualify a person’s cultural level, such as educational qualifications, linguistic ability, cultural interests, aesthetic preferences, acquired knowledge and skills. *Social* capital entails the relations that a person enters into or can mobilize, such as friendships, contacts, influences, social favours, and duties. Finally, *symbolic* capital is a person’s social recognition, which is derived from combining a person’s ability to enter into mutual relations with people who possess similar capitals (Baglioni 2016). Therefore, Baglioni’s treatment of capitals as the crux of an individual’s mode of living in any society resonates with Kabeer’s (2006) notion of ‘moral economy’ on which rural communities rely to support livelihoods in postcolonial states like Uganda. For example, capitals are presented as the incentive that encourages individuals to “put their own ‘being in society’ into practice” (Baglioni 2016, 79) beyond the institutional rights.

In summary, the conceptualization of material citizenship applied here combines the perspective of the historical evolution of citizenship wherein property has played diverse roles (Kabeer 2006) and sociological analysis of capitals (Baglioni 2016). This guides analysis of the notions of citizenship emerging from people’s descriptions of what citizenship entails, and how NGOs’ anti-poverty interventions strengthen notions of citizenship in such settings in rural Uganda. The conceptual framework, thus, alludes to citizenship as tied up with both the historical and material realities from which it emerges, on the one hand, and the ability to mobilize, expand, and rely on diverse capitals, which is necessary for recognition as a member of the community, on the other. This conceptualization becomes particularly relevant when analysing citizenship in fragile postcolonial states like Uganda.

Research context: Citizenship in Uganda, Busoga and ACFODE interventions

In this section, I illustrate how citizenship in Uganda has historically evolved in communal and material terms and show how this manifests in present day Busoga subregion. I also give a brief explanation of ACFODE and its interventions to strengthen local citizens' capacity to meet material needs.

Prior to the introduction of the liberal model of citizenship during colonialism, Ugandan society was organized as constellations of state and stateless communities (Babikwa 2004). During colonialism, these differentially governed constellations were (forcefully) merged and reconfigured into a republic with attendant ideas of constitutional democracy and citizenship rights. However, the colonial reforms did not turn Uganda into a pure Western satellite state, as traditional practices continued to grow alongside western capitalist ideals. This gave birth to a contemporary state and citizenship regime that "represents an amalgam of elements of the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial mind-sets" (Babikwa 2004, 41).

For example, while the 1995 Constitution of Uganda is clear on the political-legal status of citizenship and, in theory, guarantees a host of equal rights, including property rights (see Const. of Republic of Uganda [RoU], Ch. 3), the practice of citizenship remains saliently different. Firstly, traditional norms and practices that treat women unequally (Tamale 2020) and agrarian poverty, with over 75% of the population mired in subsistence agriculture (National Planning Authority [NPA] 2020), have persisted. Secondly, the National Resistance Movement (NRM) regime under Museveni has adopted a "neoliberal narrative that challenges citizens to take responsibility [for] developing themselves and families out of poverty" (Ahimbisibwe and Kontinen 2021, 37), rather than looking to the state for solutions. Thirdly, the Ugandan state has, over

time, adopted multiple tactics to manage, control, confuse, and suppress different forms of citizen dissent (see Tapscott 2021; Curtice and Behlendorf 2021).

These circumstances mean that the idea of citizenship in Uganda is focused more on localized obligations and less on (legal political) rights ((Ndidde, Ahimbisibwe and Kontinen 2020). Subsequently, Alava et al. (2020, 57) have suggested that in contemporary Uganda, citizenship "manifests on one hand, in the up-front contestation and mobilization of visible opposition figures with increased popular support and, on the other, continuously in mundane everyday life where problems are solved and shared issues are addressed together" in line with histories and contexts of ethnicity, gender, and other issues. For instance, a typical citizen in a rural area is defined not by the rights they enjoy but by their hours of hard work: toiling in the fields, caring for the sick, collecting water, and entering into mutual networks with neighbours and co-villagers to expand opportunities for survival. In this context, spaces of affiliation and communal identity – and, over the last four decades, NGOs – continue to be critical elements in how poor people organize themselves to survive and fulfil their obligations and responsibilities in Uganda (see Holma and Kontinen 2020c).

Busoga in eastern Uganda bears the characteristics of citizenship described in the foregoing discussion. According to official government reports, the region is one of the poorest in the country, with poverty standing at 42% compared to the national level of 21.4% (NPA 2020, 7). The region is also home to cultural beliefs and practices (RoU 2020) that differentially treat men and women. Moreover, a 2016 report by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) profiles Namutumba District, the location of this study, as highly vulnerable to socioeconomic factors such as "power relationships and institutions or cultural aspects of a social system" (RoU 2016, 31) that, among other features, frame female children as sources of wealth (New Vision 2011). Ac-

According to local media reports, this mindset, exacerbated by poverty and soaring population growth, has led to high drop-out rates from school, especially among girls, leading to teenage pregnancies, early marriages and gender-based violence (see for example, New Vision 2011; Daily Monitor 2020; Chimpreports 2021). It is against this background that NGOs like ACFODE implement development interventions that aim to improve the material wellbeing and household incomes of poor citizens in a bid to fight poverty and its attendant consequences in the community.

ACFODE is a national gender advocacy NGO with a long history of implementing interventions that empower communities. It has been at the forefront of championing the gender agenda in line with its vision of “a just society where gender equality is a reality” (ACFODE 2015). Established in 1986, donor-funded ACFODE is one of the largest NGOs operating in the four regions of the country, implementing interventions in thematic areas of governance and citizen participation, women’s economic empowerment, gender-based violence, and community livelihoods (ACFODE 2015). In an attempt to promote citizen agency in Uganda’s restrictive and volatile politics, ACFODE has, over time, adopted an approach that seeks a delicate balance between national level advocacy on good governance and community development programmes (Kontinen and Ndidde 2020).

For example, while intent on transforming unequal gender structures, ACFODE realized the importance of strategically engaging and integrating men and cultural and religious leaders into training sessions and other activities in order to respond to existing social power patterns in communities (Kontinen and Ndidde 2020). In Namutumba District, ACFODE implemented a three-year (2012-2014) livelihood programme that strengthened farmers’ knowledge and skills, in order to achieve, improve, and maintain food security, production, storage, value addition, and marketing (ACFODE 2015). Using exist-

ing village-based self-help groups, the NGO trained participants to diversify household income and address malnutrition. Trained members were supplied with simple farm implements such as “groundnut shellers, cassava chippers, spray pumps to enhance their food production, fetch better prices and improve livelihoods” (ACFODE 2015, 41).

Methods

This article is based on data collected for the larger project *Growth into Citizenship* (GROW) (2017-2019) that was “interested in local definitions of ‘citizenship’ and what role, if any, NGOs played in the everyday life of the community members” (Holma and Kontinen 2020a, 7). I collected the data together with my co-researcher, Alice, in March 2017 in three rural villages in Namutumba District. As in most agrarian communities in Uganda, community members own and live on their own (small) pieces of land on which they practise subsistence farming as their main livelihood activity. Thirty-two (4 males, 28 females) community members participated in this study and were purposively selected based on the criteria of having been active in implementing ACFODE knowledge and skills. The study was guided by open-ended and conversational themes that addressed local understandings of citizenship and practices and spaces of belonging, participation, and identity. The main intention was to observe, capture, and illustrate stories of what being a citizen entailed in everyday life of the community that had benefited from a three-year livelihoods project implemented by ACFODE between 2012-2014.

The study conducted interviews and participant observation in informal and spontaneous activities in which we found the participants engaged, and in touring projects around participants’ homesteads. This interaction was useful for creating and strengthening the atmosphere of honesty, mutuality, and conviviality vital to the successful implementation

of participatory research (Genat 2009). The interactive interviews, conducted in the local language (Lusoga¹), lasted 45-60 minutes and were audio-recorded and later transcribed and translated into English. Ethically, we were guided by the principles of participatory research and had a fair knowledge of the culture and language of the participants, which assisted us in our interactions. For example, to avoid appearing ‘elitist and privileged’ we walked through the village guided by local leaders, spoke the local language, and were cautious not to enter ‘culturally sensitive’ sections of the homesteads.

A thematic approach was used for data analysis (Vaismoradi et al. 2016; Braun and Clarke 2006). Tentative themes on the prominence of resources and the NGO’s contribution to increasing household resources emerged already from participants’ narratives and illustrations during fieldwork. At the end of each day in the field, reflections on the day’s fieldwork crystallized these themes into something tangible that could be discerned in the way that participants enthusiastically talked about how they had benefitted from ACFODE’s livelihood interventions. Later, following steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), iterative movement between data led to the emergence of two broad themes: *obutyamye* as (in)equality of citizenship, and the impact of ACFODE’s antipoverty efforts as both strengthening and reproducing *obutyamye* as an (un)equal experience.

Findings

This section presents the findings that local understanding of citizenship is based on and intertwined with what people have. It also explores how ACFODE uses context-sensitive

¹ Though not a native speaker, I have functional knowledge of, and therefore conducted the interviews in, Lusoga language. However, the interviews were transcribed and translated in English by an expert in Lusoga language.

methods and content to enhance peoples’ abilities to own resources that, at the local level, are crucial in fulfilling both individual and community obligations and expectations.

The notion of *obutyamye*: Citizenship *in*, *for*, and *with* community

In Lusoga, the local word for ‘citizen’ is *omutyamye* (pl. *abutyamye*). The word comes from the verb *okutyama* which means to be ensconced or to sit firmly (on land/soil). Citizenship is translated as *obutyamye* which literally means the act or practice of being *seated* or entrenched in the community. Listening to and later reading through participants’ explanations, it became evident that the notion of *obutyamye* expressed a broader idea of citizenship as an experience that connects everyday living with material resources and relations. To present these ideas, I use three prepositions – *in*, *for*, and *with* – to categorize and explain participants’ descriptions of *obutyamye* as an experience of being a citizen *in*, *for*, and *with* the community.

First, the notion of *obutyamye* as an experience of being a citizen *in* the community emphasized the person-material relationship. Central to this relationship is land, the main source of livelihoods and power distribution in agrarian communities. Land was critical in defining personhood since it guarantees physicalness and permanence of residence, collateral security, and claims of belonging and identity. There was unanimity in describing a citizen as “a person who has material assets, especially land on which they are consistently and permanently settled for a period of time [ranging from five months to several years]”. Other descriptions of a citizen emphasized “being born and known by everyone in this village” and “being registered in the community book”. These descriptions equated citizenship with permanence of settlement (on land) which, in community understanding, guarded against infiltration of the community by the wrong people.

Second, *obutyamye* expressed the idea of being a citizen *for* the community. This emphasizes the idea of belonging expressed in the ability and willingness of the individual not only to provide for the needs of his/her family but also to maintain mutual and reciprocal relations with others. Thus, while possession of land is critical, it is, nonetheless, not enough to define one's community membership. In addition, the *omutyamye* ought to "have built a house, married a wife, produced children, and be engaged in some economic activities for the survival and sustenance of the family". Moreover, participants also argued that a citizen ought to behave and act in a manner considered by the community to constitute good and responsible membership. A male participant suggested that when a community member behaves and acts contrary to community expectations and norms, "you can be asked to account for why you do so, and if you don't reform, you [will] be reprimanded".

Third, *obutyamye* expressed the idea of being a citizen *with* the community. This connotes the ideals of (active) participation in community affairs. In most rural areas, the tradition of communal life obliges every member to participate in dealing with issues that promote the wellbeing of the entire community. As such, issues such as funeral wakes, sickness, security emergencies, wedding ceremonies, religious functions, and communal work carry marks of 'obligatory' citizenship duties. Moreover, following increased NGO involvement in grassroots development, membership in one of the self-help groups through which most training programmes and interventions are implemented was also mentioned as mark of good citizenship. As a male participant suggested, *obutyamye*

requires that when community meetings are called, you must attend. Or let's say during times of need, one must be involved with others. Because someone can be residing in the community but when there is a funeral, they don't at-

tend. When there is a problem, they don't participate in finding solution. There you cannot be a good citizen.

***Obutyamye*: Gendered and resource inequality?**

From the foregoing discussion, it can be argued that the understanding and practice of *obutyamye*, as "a citizenship regime based on property ownership" (Wittman 2009, 120), has strong connotations of local power asymmetries based on resource ownership and gender. Firstly, embedded in the notion of *obutyamye* is the idea that landless and propertyless members, who are often the poorest of the poor, are not considered (good) citizens in the community. A landless person, for example, is referred to as *omusenze* (pl. *abasenze*), which means a squatter or a person sitting on the periphery of the community. In daily community experience, people such as squatters, casual labourers, and generally the poorest of those without land (usually mostly women) depend on those with wealth for survival. On account of being propertyless and therefore unsettled, people in these categories face various forms of exclusion in the exercise of *obutyamye*. While it was not within the scope of this study to explore these categories of people, that they could be discriminated against was evident in participants' descriptions of localized citizenship.

A person who has no land or property cannot be considered an *omutyamye* because he or she will be renting with nothing to keep him permanently settled [in a locatable place]. Today he is here, next month he is somewhere [else]. He is always on the move. It is the same thing with casual labourers who are always searching for their next work anywhere. (Female participant)

It was against this background that during the

study we encountered some arguments that challenged the citizenship status of women (see Ndidde, Ahimbisibwe, and Kontinen 2020). The arguments revolved around cultural practices related to women, marriage and property ownership. Like most communities in Uganda, Busoga culture upholds patriarchal ideas, beliefs, and customs, reinforced by, among other institutions, patrilocal marriage arrangements and practices that present woman as part of a ‘man’s property’. Encapsulating this notion is the popular local adage: *omwami kyakoba zena kyenkoba* (a man’s/husband’s word is final and undisputable in the home). In practice, when women get married, they shift from their father’s village and adopt all the ‘citizenship’ practices of the husband’s community but, even in their marital life, they remain ‘citizens’ only for as long as the marriage lasts. This dilemma is captured by the following voice:

For me, a citizen is a person who is resident in the community. This excludes us women who just come to marry. Like me now as a woman, I left my parents’ home and got married here. So, I cannot claim citizenship at my father’s village. I will spend the rest of my life here as long as I am still married here. If I divorce, I assume the residence of my new husband. (Female participant)

This view corroborates what studies have concluded about women’s citizenship in many postcolonial contexts where the dominant communal way of life has not transformed at the same pace as that endorsed by the state (Kabeer 2006). Because “citizenship had been drawn according to a quintessentially male template” (Lister 2008, 5–6), customs and traditions continue to govern the spectrum of what one can do, own, access, and control at family and community levels on the basis of the gender. This disproportionately affects women, making them more vulnerable to material poverty. Thus, land ownership is critical

in local perceptions of citizenship, which has major implications for women who, traditionally, do not own land. In essence, this perception makes women’s citizenship temporary, as belonging neither in their father’s village nor their husband’s community.

ACFODE’s contribution to strengthening the notion of *obutyamye*

In this section I explore how ACFODE’s anti-poverty initiatives contribute to localized understandings that bind citizenship to material resources. I show that by adopting a grassroots methodology and content, the NGO both reinforced and challenged existing notions of citizenship by enhancing members’ capacities to fulfil individual and collective responsibilities.

ACFODE’s livelihood content: Addressing material poverty

ACFODE’s antipoverty interventions focused on improving livelihood knowledge and skills in the areas of smallholder farming and income diversification. According to participants, livelihood training in improved farming practices “did not leave us the same”, as they learnt about the entire farming chain from the preparation of seedbeds to post-harvest handling, value addition, and sale. During this study, participants showed us how, after training, they shifted from the traditional practice of sowing by broadcasting mixed seeds, to line and spaced sowing of one variety of cereal. This, they argued, resulted in high quality and marketable yields. A female participant summarized the training content in this way:

The training addressed the whole chain of farming from sowing to selling. The main emphasis was on growing enough food using improved farming methods of line and spaced planting. We also learnt

value addition – for example, by drying harvested maize on mats or tarpaulins so we can sell it at a high price. They trained us to add value to cassava to get several products such as food, chips, cassava bread, and pancakes. Then soya bean can be fried and sold to get money, or mixed with maize grains and milled to make porridge for children. We were also trained to make juice out of avocados, mangoes, oranges, and passion fruits.

In an agrarian community, this kind of training resonated with the material realities and practical needs of the people and did not attempt to introduce innovations alien to existing agricultural practices and norms. A participant couple argued that “this farming knowledge is easy for us because we have land and can easily get seeds to sow”. Another male participant claimed that they found the training sustainable because, even when ACFODE left, “[knowledge] will never be taken away as we can practically pass it on to our children and grandchildren”. Observation in the villages identified the application of the acquired knowledge and skills: for example, several homesteads had backyard vegetable gardens and plots of land with cereals planted in spaced lines, while others had improved post-harvest handling and storage facilities. In another case, a female participant we interviewed made snacks that were sold along the village path near her home. Each of the thirty-two households visited for this study maintained a well-kept and kempt living room with modest furniture, reared some livestock (chicken, goats, cows) and owned well-tended gardens of crops planted in lines.

Methodology of self-help groups: Building citizen capabilities

To implement its livelihood trainings, ACFODE used the methodology of village membership-based groups, which this study

found to play an important role in challenging poverty and reinforcing the members’ agency to improve their own material wellbeing.

First, self-help groups epitomize the citizenship ideals encapsulated in the notion of *obutyamye*. Built on communalist ideals, they are hubs of citizenship activities, as membership and participation are determined by physical residence, moral obligation, and social identification with the community. Self-help groups were key in building strong social bonding, resilience, and incremental progress, and members often clung onto them when setbacks occurred. A female participant narrated how her group survived several project failures and found alternatives.

In our group we started with saving little money. But the way we were saving, we started buying household items, such as plates, saucepans, cups, and bedding materials. This helped to improve our homes. When every member was covered, we changed and started contributing money to members in rounds. Members used this pooled money to do different things such as starting small income-generating projects, paying school fees, buying pieces of land, and so on.

She continued,

When we were done with that, we started a piggery project. Unfortunately, we were cheated by the person who was in charge. We lost that money. Then we tried poultry, which was wiped out by an epidemic outbreak. We became frustrated but refused to give up. So, we decided to buy tents and chairs which we hire out during functions. This has improved our income as a group.

Second, self-help groups offered a platform for members, especially women, to acquire and draw on various resources with which to address material poverty. Collective and peer

learning provided by the platforms of self-help groups enabled the poor to pool resources and build multiple livelihood options. In turn, women gained the capacity to contribute to material wellbeing, challenging the traditional idea of male breadwinning because, according to a female participant, “women stopped depending on husbands for everything”. Thus, local groups were used as avenues for training and supporting members to diversify incomes to live a better life. As one female participant claimed,

Right now, the knowledge ACFODE gave us is what we use. The way they found us is not the way we are right now...women in this village cook/prepare different snacks which they sell in the trading centre. Some people joined the business of buying and selling silver fish. As for me, I have bought goats which you can see over there [pointing to half a dozen goats tethered in the nearby bush].

Another female participant observed,

Before ACFODE came, children were seated at home and often wandered around the village stealing fruits from neighbours’ gardens, looking for what to eat. Household heads, especially men, shouldered the burden of buying food. Now ACFODE [has] trained us in better farming methods. We have enough food and incomes have increased so children are in school.

In a conversation with a female participant, she explained how she had saved money to the tune of 2,000,000 UgX (two million Uganda shillings, approx. €500) through self-help groups, and bought a plot of land in the trading centre on which she was beginning to construct a commercial building. It can thus be argued that self-help groups were instrumental in promoting material citizenship. From

the modest goals of acquiring basic household items, such as cutlery, seats, and bedding, to buying pieces of land and establishing group businesses, self-help groups changed gender relations and gradually built the capacities in members to achieve modest material improvements and meet various obligations at individual and community levels.

Discussion

This section discusses two issues. First, it looks at what the notion of *obutyamye* portends for local power dynamics in the exercise of citizenship. Second, it reflects on how and why NGO anti-poverty interventions improve the resources of the poor and, thereby, their material citizenship.

In its localized conceptualization, the notion of *obutyamye* is laden with local power asymmetries that exclude and treat sections of the population as unequal citizens. The understanding of citizenship in terms of having wealth (*in*) as a basis of belonging (*for*) and participation in community (*with*) implies that a member who falls short in meeting these criteria for being a citizen faces differentiated treatment. Embedded in the notion of *obutyamye*, therefore, is the idea that the propertyless do not meet the criteria by which status and membership in the community is determined. This argument resonates with Baglioni’s (2016, 69) observation that, “if the status of citizen is seen principally as a collective-individual guarantee that aims at a tangential social equality and that postulates a tangential cultural uniformity, a growing proportion of people will remain excluded.”

Moreover, as Lister (1997) has argued, poverty remains one of the corrosive impediments to the practice of citizenship, and affects the ability of many to realize their potential and exercise their rights. For instance, a report by UNICEF (2020) shows that 47% of households in Uganda are trapped in multidimensional poverty and are therefore, un-

able to draw on different resources for basic survival. Thus, despite an avalanche of NGO grassroots-driven development efforts, there remains concern that these approaches “seldom work for the poorest who lack the agency to fully participate” (Hickey 2010, 1145) due to “problems of uneven development” (2010, 1149). As illustrated by findings, while most men are perceived as citizens due to land ownership, which gives them more ‘permanence’, women’s citizenship hinges on their ‘temporal’ residence as either born in or married into the community. Similarly, propertyless men, who often occupy the lowest rungs of society, are not regarded as equal citizens in the community. Ultimately, both propertyless men and majority women face varied extents of differentiated treatment in everyday perception and practice of citizenship. It can be argued, therefore, that the ideals of equality embedded in *obutyamye* are not wholly inclusive and accommodative of “the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind” (UN 2015, 37) in agrarian societies like Busoga.

Nonetheless, based on the interaction with communities, it was apparent that *obutyamye* is premised more on the philosophy of fostering and strengthening practices of mutual belonging than on deliberately promoting segregation against the poorest in the community. The all-round communal idea behind *obutyamye* is that citizenship should primarily be concerned with jointly finding solutions to commonly felt problems and performing shared community obligations and expectations. Every citizen is, therefore, supposed to make a contribution towards the things that the community has identified and agreed upon as crucial for self-sustainability and co-existence. This is because in post-colonial states like Uganda, services that ameliorate the material conditions of people are rarely accessed through the institutional relationship between citizens and the state. Rather, everyday life is concerned with taking care of one’s material survival, mainly through informal associations, kith and kin, extended family, patron-

age networks (e.g. Pettit 2016), and, increasingly, development-oriented NGOs (Scherz 2014). For example, as the findings of this study have shown, ACFODE’s training economically empowered women and improved their agency to meet family and community obligations. Similarly, a casual labourer or immigrant who works hard, acquires property, and actively and consistently participates in collective efforts, progressively integrates into the community as *omutyamye*. It follows that the *obutyamye* view, although embedded in unequal power and resource distribution, does not emphasize a citizenship experience in which less privileged members are rigidly and permanently excluded from being citizens *in, for, and with* the community.

This brings the discussion to the role of self-help groups in the practice of everyday material citizenship among the poor in sub-Saharan Africa. MacLean (2017) has argued that self-help groups predate the modern nation state in Africa and have historically acted as organized welfare provision at the grassroots level. A pillar of the communal way of life, self-help groups have withstood the seminal influences unleashed on “the grain of African social formations” by the notion of liberal citizenship such as “democracy, human rights, women’s rights and good governance” (Kelsall 2011, 244). As such, everyday citizenship practices continue to take place within communal spaces that are premised on and espouse ideals of egalitarian association, reciprocity, neighbourliness, solidarity, collective identity, and belonging (Rodima-Taylor 2013; Benda 2012), hinged on one’s residence within the community. It is therefore uncommon to find a community member who does not belong to any of the many local forms of association, be they religious, cultural, extended family, peer group, or, more importantly, self-help group.

Therefore, for NGOs like ACFODE intent on addressing material inequalities through socioeconomic empowerment programmes for the poor and vulnerable, ‘going

with the grain' (Kelsall 2011) of grassroots, informal associations seem to provide an appropriate route. These historically tried and tested practices offer more effective mechanisms for reaching the least privileged and increasing the agency of the rural poor to gain financial and material empowerment that positively impacts on gendered relations. When I asked a woman what her future entailed, she replied, "God willing, I will continue using the knowledge received from all these [self-help and NGO] groups to keep bettering my family." Moreover, while this study was conducted three years after the project had ended, participants constantly referred to the NGO as *omuzaire waife* ('our caring parent') in apparent acknowledgement of the positive material changes it had introduced to their lives.

Conclusion

First, the article has introduced and conceptualized a localized notion of material citizenship, to add to the other forms of everyday citizenship in the "context of development interventions in sub-Saharan Africa" (Holma, Kontinen, and Blanken-Webb 2018, 228). Using the notion of *obutyamye*, I have illustrated how, in specific locations of Uganda, citizenship is broadly construed as being *in*, *for*, and *with* the community, based on the diverse material assets and forms of capital on which individuals draw to meet their family needs and communal obligations. This article has also shown how various resources such as land, household items, social relations, and knowledge and skills are crucial in defining and enhancing one's personhood and agency to act as a citizen, knitting the community into a web of networked, reciprocal, and mutual belonging and participation. Moreover, the article has analysed the impact of NGOs in strengthening localized notions of citizenship in a setting where structural, national, and local hierarchies of power remain profound constraints on the practice of citizenship, especially among

women and landless men.

Second, the article has highlighted the inescapable connection between local people's material wellbeing and their extant citizenship experiences. For instance, while post-colonial states like Uganda grant 'universalized' liberal rights to undifferentiated citizens, local communities often translate (and sometimes overrule) these rights to suit their existing material realities and circumstances. Thus, the notion of material citizenship articulated in this article is neither about advancing individual's self-interest nor promoting exclusive power of community. Rather, it is premised on an endless search for socioeconomic improvement and communal co-existence among people who share physical residency and take care of shared interests. This involves the (re-)negotiation of complex social structures and dynamics using the available material resources and social relations.

Last, material citizenship espoused by the idea of *obutyamye* contributes to a more contextual understanding of the dynamics of NGOs' attempts to strengthen citizenship in the constrained settings of postcolonial societies like Uganda. I have demonstrated that, rather than relying on statist rights, rural people depend on local mobilization and NGO anti-poverty interventions to improve their status and agency to address individual and collective challenges. Self-help groups and NGOs' socioeconomic empowerment programmes are thus vital platforms and avenues for marginalized groups to acquire material assets and build social relations that change perceptions and strengthen practices of citizenship. Women, for example, gradually become citizens *in*, *for*, and *with* the community on account of their ability to acquire and own material assets and meet community expectations and responsibilities that society considers vital citizenship characteristics. Hence, the material improvements and agency ordinary citizens acquire from such NGO interventions, even though not overly transformative, should not be underestimated.

That said, the limited operational capacity of NGOs and self-help groups to reach the poorest sections of the community and address systemic problems that constrain their participation in community development programmes remains a challenge. Ultimately,

more equitable development that leaves no citizen behind can only be realised through state intervention because it is the state that has the capacity and obligation to address such structural inequalities.

References

- ACFODE. 2015. "Celebrating a Journey of Passion for a Just Society. ACFODE 30 Years." *Arise: A Women's Development Magazine Published by ACFODE* 59: 1–68. Accessed November 18, 2022. https://www.kas.de/documents/252038/253252/7_dokument_dok_pdf_44693_2.pdf/d04afc99-a3c6-460f-9744-ca750fef5062?version=1.0&t=1539651023251.
- African Union Commission. 2015. "Agenda 2063: The Future We Want for Africa." Addis Ababa: The African Union Commission, Addis Ababa.
- Ahimbisibwe, Karembe F., and Tiina Kontinen. 2021. "Localizing SDGs in Rural Uganda: Learning Active Citizenship through Saemaul Undong-Model." In *Sustainable Development Goals for Society Vol 1: Selected Topics of Global Relevance*, edited by Godwell Nhamo, Muchaiteyo Togo, and Kaitano Dube, 37–50. Cham: Springer.
- Alava, Henni, Twine H. Bananuka, Karembe F. Ahimbisibwe, and Tiina Kontinen. 2020. "Contextualizing Citizenship in Uganda." In *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, edited by Katariina Holma and Tiina Kontinen, 57–72. London: Routledge.
- Babikwa, Daniel. 2004. "The Political Economy of Adult Education in Uganda." In *Adult Education in Uganda: Growth, Development, Prospects, and Challenges*, edited by Anthony Okech, 35–50. Kampala, Uganda: Fountain Publishers.
- Baglioni, Lorenzo Grifone. 2016. "A Reflection on Material Citizenship." *Società Mutamento Politica* 7, no. 13: 67–81.
- Banks, Nicola, David Hulme, and Michael Edwards. 2015. "NGOs, States, and Donors Revisited: Still Too Close for Comfort?" *World Development* 66: 707–718.
- Benda, Cecilia. 2012. "Community Rotating Savings and Credit Associations as an Agent of Well-Being: A Case Study from Northern Rwanda." *Community Development Journal* 48, no. 2: 232–247.
- Bird, Kate, and Jessica Espey. 2010. "Power, Patriarchy and Land: Examining Women's Land Rights in Uganda and Rwanda". In *The International Handbook of Gender and Poverty: Concepts, Research, Policy*, edited by Sylvia Chant, 360–366. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education*, edited by John G Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2: 77–101.
- Brockington, Dan, and Christine Noe, eds. 2021. *Prosperity in Rural Africa?: Insights into Wealth, Assets, and Poverty from Longitudinal Studies in Tanzania*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Carswell, Grace, and Geert De Neve. 2020. "Paperwork, Patronage, and Citizenship: The Materiality of Everyday Interactions with Bureaucracy in Tamil Nadu, India." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 26: 495–514.
- Chimpreports. 2021. "UBOS Report: Busoga Ranked Poorest Region, Again." *Chimpreports Online News*, 06/03/2021. Accessed June 12, 2021. <https://chimpreports.com/ubos-report-busoga-ranked-poorest-region-again/>.
- Clarke, John, Kathleen Coll, Evelina Dagnino, and Catherine Neveu. 2014. *Disputing Citizenship*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Curtice, Travis B, and Brandon Behlendorf. 2021. "Street-Level Repression: Protest, Policing, and Dissent in Uganda." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 65, no. 1: 166–194.
- Daily Monitor. 2020. "Kamuli, Namutumba Top Busoga in GBV - Report." *Nation Media Group Ltd*, 14/07/2020. Accessed October 8, 2020. <https://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/Kamuli-Namutumba-top-Busoga-GBV-report/688334-5593042-ox8ft9z/index.html>.
- Frey, Bruno S. 2003. "Flexible Citizenship for a Global Society." *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 2, no. 1: 93–114.
- Genat, Bill. 2009. "Building Emergent Situated Knowledges in Participatory Action Research." *Action Research* 7, no. 1: 101–115.
- Geschiere, Peter. 2009. *The Perils of Belonging: Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. University of Chicago Press.
- Harrison, Graham. 2010. "The Africanization of Poverty: A Retrospective on 'Make Poverty History'." *African Affairs* 109/436: 391–408.
- Hickey, Sam. 2010. "The Government of Chronic Poverty: From Exclusion to Citizenship?" *The Journal of Development Studies* 46, no. 7: 1139–1155.
- Holma, Katariina, and Tiina Kontinen. 2020a. "Introduction." In *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, edited by Tiina Kontinen and Katariina Holma, 1–12. London: Routledge.
- Holma, Katariina, and Tiina Kontinen. 2020b. "Practices and Habits of Citizenship and Learning." In *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, edited by Katariina Holma and Tiina Kontinen, 15–28. London: Routledge.
- Holma, Katariina, and Tiina Kontinen, eds. 2020c. *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*. London: Routledge.
- Holma, Katariina, Tiina Kontinen, and Jane Blanken-Webb. 2018. "Growth into Citizenship: Framework for Conceptualizing Learning in NGO Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Adult Education Quarterly* 68, no. 3: 215–234.

- Jones, Ben. 2009. *Beyond the State in Rural Uganda*. London: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kabeer, Naila. 2006. "Citizenship, Affiliation and Exclusion: Perspectives from the South." *IDS Bulletin* 37, no. 4: 91–101.
- Kartal, Filiz. 2002. "Liberal and Republican Conceptualizations of Citizenship: A Theoretical Inquiry." *Turkish Public Administration Annual* 27–28: 101–130.
- Kelsall, Tim. 2011. "Going with the Grain in African Development?" *Development Policy Review* 29, no. 1: 223–251.
- Kontinen, Tiina, and Alice N Ndidde. 2020. "Learning in a Ugandan Gender Advocacy NGO: Organizational Growth and Institutional Wrestling." In *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, edited by Katariina Holma and Tiina Kontinen, 176–193. London: Routledge.
- Lee, Kellyn, and Ruth Bartlett. 2021. "Material Citizenship: An Ethnographic Study Exploring Object–Person Relations in the Context of People with Dementia in Care Homes." *Sociology of Health & Illness* 43: 1471–1485.
- Lister, Ruth. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave.
- Lister, Ruth. 2008. "Inclusive Citizenship, Gender and Poverty: Some Implications for Education for Citizenship." *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 4, no. 1: 3–19.
- Lund, Christian. 2011. "Property and Citizenship: Conceptually Connecting Land Rights and Belonging in Africa." *Africa Spectrum* 46, no. 3: 71–75.
- MacLean, Lauren M. 2017. "Neoliberal Democratisation, Colonial Legacies and the Rise of the Non-State Provision of Social Welfare in West Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 44, no. 153: 358–380.
- Mbazira, Christopher. 2018. "An Inclusive Judiciary for Sustainable Development: Connecting the Dots." In *Keynote Address Delivered at the Annual Judges Conference, Kampala*. Kampala, Uganda.
- Mercer, Claire. 2002. "NGOs, Civil Society and Democratization: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Progress in Development Studies* 2, no. 1: 5–22.
- Mukhopadhyay, Matrayee. 2015. "Gendered Citizenship in the Postcolony: The Challenge for Transformational Feminist Politics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Transnational Feminist Movements*, edited by Rawwida Baksh and Wendy Harcourt, 607–628. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Ndidde, Alice Nankya, Karembe F. Ahimbisibwe, and Tiina Kontinen. 2020. "Gendered Citizenship in Rural Uganda: Localised, Exclusive and Active." In *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, edited by Katariina Holma and Tiina Kontinen, 105–120. London: Routledge.
- New Vision. 2011. "My Daughter, My Wealth: The Plight of Namutumba's Child Mothers." *Vision Group Ltd*, 15/12/2011. Accessed October 8, 2020. <https://www.newvision.co.ug/news/1004240/daughter-wealth-plight-namutumba-child-mothers>.
- NPA. 2020. "Third National Development Plan (NDPIII) 2020/21 – 2024/25." Kampala: Republic of Uganda.
- Nyakato, Viola N., Charles Rwabukwali, and Susan Cools. 2020. "Women's Land Rights and Maternal Healthcare in Southwestern Uganda: Exploring the Implications of Women's Decision-Making Regarding Sale and Use of Land on Access to Maternal Healthcare." *African Journal of Reproductive Health* 24, no. 1: 62–80.
- Obika, Julaina. 2022. "The Intimate Governance of Land in Northern Uganda." *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 31, no. 2: 136–152.
- Pettit, Jethro. 2016. "Why Citizens Don't Engage—Power, Poverty and Civic Habitus." *IDS Bulletin* 47, no. 5: 89–102.
- Rodima-Taylor, Daivi. 2013. "Gathering Up Mutual Help: Relational Freedoms of Tanzanian Market-Women." *Social Analysis* 57, no. 3: 76–94.
- Ron, Amit. 2014. "Citizen/Citizenship." *The Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*, edited by Michael Gibbons, 1–8. Wiley Online Library.
- RoU. 2016. "Namutumba District: Hazard, Risk and Vulnerability Profile." Kampala, Uganda: Office of Prime Minister.
- Scherz, China. 2014. *Having People, Having Heart: Charity, Sustainable Development, and Problems of Dependence in Central Uganda*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tamale, Sylvia. 2020. *Decolonization and Afro-Feminism*. Ottawa: Daraja Press.
- Tapscott, Rebecca. 2021. *Arbitrary States: Social Control and Modern Authoritarianism in Museveni's Uganda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, Bryan S. 1993. "Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship." In *Citizenship and Social Theory*, edited by Bryan S. Turner, 1–8. London: Sage.
- UN. 2015. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1)*. New York: United Nations.

UNICEF. 2020. "Going beyond Monetary Poverty: Uganda's Multidimensional Poverty Profile." UNICEF, Uganda Country Office: Kampala, Uganda.

Vaismoradi, Mojtaba, Jacqueline Jones, Hannele Turunen, and Sherrill Snelgrove. 2016. "Theme Development in Qualitative Content Analysis and Thematic Analysis." *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice* 6, no. 5: 100–110.

Wittman, Hannah. 2009. "Reframing Agrarian Citizenship: Land, Life and Power in Brazil." *Journal of Rural Studies* 25, no. 1: 120–130.

World Voices Uganda. 2020. "Capacity Assessment of Informal Justice Actors in Delivering Justice: Compliance with Constitutional Requirements and International Human Right Standards." Kampala, Uganda: World Voices Uganda and DGF, Kampala.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1999. "The 'Multi-Layered Citizen'." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1, no. 1: 119–136.